

The INL SEB has received 180 comments regarding the potential privatization of bus operations. The comments include concerns that generally fall into the categories of safety (fatalities as a result of speeding, winter conditions, drowsy drivers), highway access and congestion, availability of parking at the site, increased costs to employees, quality of service, and air pollution.

The questions and comments received are posted for information purposes.

**Bus Comments
for
Draft RFP No. DE-RP07-03ID14517
Comments Submitted Through 03/08/2004**

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 5 (Code 20)

C.

I can not find any requirement to operate the bus service. Furthermore, in the press release DOE indicates that the Bus Service is to be subcontracted out. I believe that this will be devastating to Laboratory in the long run, or it is simply a mechanism to make the employees bear the cost of travel.

Two years ago I prepared an analysis of the Bus service for BBWI. The annual savings in lives as a result of the bus service exceeds the cost of operation, independent of any other benefit. This is due to the reduced traffic and the skill of the bus drivers.

By subcontracting the bus service, DOE is attempting to relay the cost to the passengers, many who will choose to drive, further increasing the cost of service and further increasing the highway traffic.

With the value of a human life at somewhere between \$2.4 M and \$4.8 M it only takes a few fatalities to pay for the annual cost of bus service operated correctly as it has in the past. The alternative is to pass the financial cost on to the State to upgrade the highways and increase snow/ice removal.

Please place safety first.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 9 (Code 26)

My questions and comments concern DOE's decision to "launch privatization" of bus operations, as referenced in the press release of February 5th. Outsourcing bus transportation will likely result in fare increases to generate sufficient revenues to insure profitability for a for-profit outside contractor. If fares rise enough, it could compel employees who now utilize the service to drive their private vehicles, further adding to the daily traffic snarl we experience on the highways leading to the INEEL facilities.

The bus system at the INEEL has been providing convenient and low-cost transportation to the employees of the INEEL for over 50 years, with a safety record unmatched in the industry. I hope that this decision was not made simply as another "cost savings", because the ultimate price will be much higher in an increase in injuries and fatalities.

When and how does DOE plan to have this privatization implemented? Are subsidies to the employees who wish to ride the bus being considered? The employees of the INEEL have a huge stake in the outcome of the privatization of bus services. A timely and informative accounting of what is driving this decision is imperative, and we deserve nothing less. Thank You

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 16 (Code 35)

Privatization of Bus Fleet:

We would ask DOE to reconsider this decision for the following reasoning and what this reasoning is based on.

Safety: Mine own, I drive a delivery truck between the site and Idaho Falls daily, my family and friends, my co-workers and the rest of the folks who travel past the INEEL, We have to deal with an increased number of government, private and company owned vehicles on narrow two lane road ways. Like every where else we have the wing nuts who tend to ignore the rules of the road, are unable to drive in a safe and mature fashion for the road, weather and traffic conditions, putting all of us at risk

Productivity: Productivity is lost when employee's who drive become stressed due to bad roads, poor planning, those who fail to follow the rules of the road and the fear of being late for work. It is also lost in that those who drive normally leave work early to avoid the traffic and bad road. Every group on the INEEL, DOE included, has a problem in this area.

Environmental: With increased traffic you will have an increase in the amount pollutants put into the air.

Increased Natural Resource use: With increased traffic there will be an increase in the amount of fossil fuel used. Something we have to look at and avoid.

Facts: The bus transportation system is a very important part of safety, to, from and on the INEEL. Any increase in cost or reduction of service, route elimination or park and ride will increase the number of employee's who choose to drive.

The roadways use to the INEEL site are State highway 20, 26 and 33. These roadways are two lane, 65 mile per hour, with rolling hills, cutting through heavy agricultural areas with narrow shoulders, (note: a car pulled on to the shoulder has to leave the asphalt in order for them to be clear of the roadway in most places). The average speed, per the Idaho State Police, is 72 miles per hour.

We have around six months of extreme weather conditions, ice, snow and fog on these roadways.

At the present we have 300 private, government and company vehicles that clear gate one daily, with 90% single occupancy. This does not count 150+ who go to the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC). This amount of traffic is on the road between 5:45 and 7 in the AM and between 5 and 7 in the PM.

Summery: The bus transportation service is a safety benefit to the employee. We would ask that this decision be reviewed at the highest level. DOE has made the commitment to my safety, my co-workers and the public it is hoped it will be kept.

Note: If DOE wants to improve safety for all, increase productivity, help the environment conserve natural resources and create growth with local small businesses we have a suggestion. Keep the bus transportation system in place and increase the service. Decrease the number of private, government and company vehicles by privatizing the parking lots with a daily fee at least equal to the amount the employee has to pay to ride the bus in all areas of the INEEL site. Exempt charge passes would need to be in place for the small number of employee's with temporary or permanent physical handicaps who can not use the bus system.

The same benefits could be obtained plus added security and all that it implies by not allowing private vehicles to drive onto the INEEL site without special authorization. Have the privatizing vendor build a parking lot, with a toll fee, out side of the INEEL area and use shuttle busses to transport these employee's to there work locations. This would also put a very large damper on those who like to leave early each day.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 17 (Code 36)

According to DOE press releases, the INEEL bus service will be privatized. This is all well and good but DOE must continue to subsidize the service. If the subsidy is discontinued prices will rise and bus ridership will fall as more people drive their own vehicles to the site. This would be extremely dangerous as the current two lane roads from Idaho Falls and Blackfoot would not be able to safely handle the increase in traffic.

It makes absolutely no sense to promote safety at the site, hold the contractors rigidly accountable for safety and then expose the workforce to real danger twice daily on their commute to and from the desert. Additionally bus riders get much needed rest during their commute which they need as the typical workday for a site worker runs 13 to 14 hours from pick up to drop off. This helps greatly with their productivity and also quality of life. The bus fleet also helps to cut down on automobile air pollution, which is a significant source for southeast Idaho.

If the subsidy is discontinued then DOE must immediately begin working with the state of Idaho to expand the highways from Blackfoot and Idaho Falls to four lanes to handle the increases in traffic that will surely come. These entities must also begin to better enforce the speed limits and safe driving in general on these roads.

It should also be pointed out that while significant numbers of site workers do already commute, bus ridership increases significantly in winter months with some routes even overfilling during bad weather. This serves as a sort of "safety valve" that takes additional cars off the roads to the INEEL during the worst weather lessening the hazard to all. No other DOE site has the combination of dangerous winter road conditions coupled with the long commutes from nearby population centers that the INEEL has.

While an increase in fees maybe unavoidable, the INEEL Bus Service and DOE's subsidy of that service must continue.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 24 (Code 43)

I am concerned about the cost and safety of the bus operations if they are privatized. We now have an outstanding safety record and a convenient and reliable transportation system. There is also the concern if the people quit riding the busses will there be an increased safety threat from all of the private cars that are driven to work everyday? Bus operations now have a group of professional drivers that get people to and from the site safely everyday. I am afraid that if these drivers are replaced the cost will go up and the service will go down.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 25 (Code 44)

I am sorry to hear about Bus out sourcing. I am an active bus rider. And it is the safe driving of the buses which make it easy for me to come to work. If rates go up and drivers change, I will not ride the bus along with many others and hope the highway holds all the traffic!!!!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 26 (Code 45)

I FULLY SUPPORT OUR CURRENT BUS OPERATIONS, THEIR SAFETY RECORD AND PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES, AND DEDICATION TO THIS SITE CANNOT BE REPLACED. I SUSPECT THAT ORG OPERATES IN A MORE EFFICIENT AND COST EFFECTIVE MANNER THAN MOST ON SITE.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 27 (Code 46)

Comment: The fastest, most efficient way to shut down the site would be to eliminate or privatize the bus

service.

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 28 (Code 47)

I am a current bus passenger at the INEEL and am fearful of the privatization bus transportation. This action I believe will increase cost to the users, thus increasing the use of private vehicles, increasing the danger vehicle induced fatalities.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 29 (Code 48)

After all the years of safe travel, it is seem stange that money is being placed above lives. Safe a buck, waste a life. The highway tothe site is a two lane highway. With twice the cars each day, deaths will result. people will not pay more that they do now.

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 30 (Code 49)

I personally cannot see the monetary benefits outweighing the safety aspects in privatizing the bus service to the site. If prices go up, more people will drive, increasing traffic, accidents,and maintenance. The more employees that are "displaced" here is just that much closer to eliminating the need for DOE people . Has anyone at DOE considered that???

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 31 (Code 50)

I'm concerned about the intension to privatize the bus service and the cafeteria. If we privatize the bus I'm sure the cost is going to skyrocket which will increase the number of private vehicles on the hyways. The hyways are already a death trap in the morning and evening. So why increase the risk to your employs. It is very nice to be able to go to the cafeteria and get a nice meal at a resonable cost. So why take the chance of not having this service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 32 (Code 51)

I HAVE RIDDEN THE BUS TO AND FROM THE SITE FOR THE PAST 14 YEARS, "SAFELY" I MIGHT ADD! NOW IT IS RUMORED THAT THE BUS OPERATIONS ARE TO BE OUTSOURCED! WILL IT COST MORE, IF SO MORE PEOPLE WILL DRIVE, MAKING IT EVEN MORE UN-SAFE TO BE ON THE HIGHWAY TO THE SITE. IF WE ARE TO BE SO SAFE AT ALL TIMES ON AND OFF THE JOB HOW CAN THIS MAKE SENSE!? WHY NOT LEAVE A GOOD THING ALONE? WHY PUT MORE OF US AT RISK TO SAVE MONEY!? MAYBE THE PEOPLE PROPOSING THIS OUTSOURCE SHOULD DRIVE THE ROAD TO THE SITE MORE OFTEN AND SEE HOW SCARY IT CAN BE!!!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 33 (Code 52)

My comment is concerning DOE intention to privatize the bus service at the INEEL. I feel this is a real safety

issue. The roads out to the site will become a hazard because of the extra traffic and our bus service now has proven itself to be safe and efficient. If DOE is going to talk the safety talk then prove it by not taking away the bus service and show the site workers that you are concerned for our safety!

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 34 (Code 53)

I disagree with the privatization of the guards cafeteria services, and bus services. The only purpose of this is to lower workers wages and benefits. The only purpose of this would be to make a minority subcontractor rich.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 35 (Code 54)

I would like to see the INEEL bus service remain as is--a safe, reliable, and reasonably priced service.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 36 (Code 55)

Please do not privatize the cafeteria and bus services under the RFP at the INEEL. Is worker safety or saving money more important?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 37 (Code 56)

I believe the INEEL BUS service should remain the same. The routes have already been cut considerably over the past few years. Safety is the primary concern and this would just force more private vehicles to be on the road daily. I am sure this change is inevitable but please publish the date it will change as soon as possible.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 38 (Code 57)

This comment is in regards to the privatization of the bus fleet. Due to long hours (4X10 and 4X12) and distance a good portion of the INEEL work force depend on bus service as an energy efficient and safe mode of transportation. I do not consider this an entitlement but rather DOE's commitment to maintaining a safe environment on the highway. Your attempt for cost effective bus operations through privatization is understandable; however, many are convinced that if DOE privatizes bus services we will lose our only mode of safe and cost effective (for the employee) transportation to the INEEL. I request that DOE stay committed to maintaining safe and cost effective bus operations for the employee at the INEEL.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 39 (Code 58)

I am opposed to privatizing of the INEEL bus operations. The bus drivers provide site workers with a safe, reliable means of transportation to get to and from the site on a daily basis. Their impressive safety record speaks for itself. The INEEL bus system also provides site workers with low-cost transportation. With privatization, costs will likely increase, and the use of personal vehicles will likely increase, as individuals will choose to carpool. The increase of traffic on the highways to and from the site will pose a bigger safety hazard to commuters and more auto accidents are likely.

The INEEL bus drivers are professionals who consistently transport workers to and from the Site in a safe, reliable manner. Why is it necessary to consider privatization?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 40 (Code 59)

I am concerned about the possibility of the INEEL buses being privatized. The present system is working great. It is a safe, efficient, low-cost operation. If everyone car-pooled to the site, you would have to build parking lots (there are no parking places now). You would need to build an overpass for workers coming from Blackfoot and Pocatello on Highway 26. They would spend all day trying to get across Highway 20. The air quality would deteriorate. There would be more accidents. Privatization usually means increased prices. Because of this, I know that you would have a hard time getting people to stay working at the site (they would take the first job-opening in Idaho Falls that comes along). Site workers took a cut in pay two years ago when bus passes were introduced; we can't afford another one. In conclusion, increased cost will force people to car pool and it is safer riding the bus. Shouldn't the safety of your workers come first. It's just not a good or safe deal.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 41 (Code 60)

I am very concerned about the privatization of the transportation system proposed by the RFP Draft. Our system is a low cost and very effective way to get employees to and from the site safely each day. Privatization will increase the cost of service and cause employees to drive to and from work each day. The highway is not adequate for the increase in the numbers of vehicle travel that will be incurred. An increase in accidents and fatalities is a likely result. The parking lots at the INEEL are not adequate to provide for the increased vehicles. I urge you to reconsider this action for the safety and welfare of the site employees.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 42 (Code 61)

I am a bus rider at the INEEL and I sorely object to the bus services being outsourced. I have ridden the bus daily for 14 years and enjoy knowing that I am in very capable hands with my driver and all the drivers I have had. Outsourcing the buses is a big mistake, it will not only cost alot more to ride but more people will start to drive and that will mean more deaths on the highway with more morons driving. All the years I have ridden the bus I have never worried about my safety while in the drivers hands. Outsourcing brings on tons of worries with safety and quality. Please don't outsource the buses, let's maintain our magnificent safety record with our drivers and let us continue to ride our buses in comfort and safety.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 43 (Code 62)

I would like to express my concern over the proposed privatization of the Bus Service at the INEEL. As a regular bus rider I firmly believe that the bus service is absolutely the MOST IMPORTANT Safety program going at our lab and should be fully supported by DOE as such.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 44 (Code 63)

In regard to the initiative to privatize the INEEL Bus service, I was wondering if the private bus service would be able to maintain the current level of support for the INEEL Emergency Preparedness Program? Specifically, would the private bus service provide facility and site evacuation like the present INEEL bus service?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 45 (Code 64)

I am concerned about the possibility of the INEEL buses being privatized. The present system is working great. It is a safe, efficient, low-cost operation. If everyone car-pooled to the site, you would have to build parking lots (there are no parking places now). You would need to build an overpass for workers coming from Blackfoot and Pocatello on Highway 26. They would spend all day trying to get across Highway 20. The air quality would deteriorate. There would be more accidents. Privatization usually means increased prices. Because of this, I know that you would have a hard time getting people to stay working at the site (they would take the first job-opening in Idaho Falls that came along). Site workers took a cut in pay two years ago when bus passes were introduced; we can't afford another one. In conclusion, increased cost will force people to car pool and it is safer riding the bus. Shouldn't the safety of your workers come first. It's just not a good or safe deal. The bus drivers have been so dedicated for so many years and this would be a huge impact on their lives not to mention an impact on the lives of all of us concerned. This bus service is a huge asset to site workers and the entire system has worked great for all of these years. I am sure the death rate would be extreme and surely not worth the total inconvenience of all concerned. The bus system is terrific and please consider leaving it just the way it is - safe and efficient.

Response:

Section None Selecte, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 46 (Code 65)

I disagree with the privatization of the bus service. It will create higher transportation cost and unsafe condition, because more people will drive to work.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 47 (Code 66)

I would encourage the DOE to continue with the current bus service. The current service provides a safe and cost effective means of transportation for site workers, most them living a minimum of 45 miles from the site. Rumors are that the cost will increase considerably.

The rate we are currently paying is close to, if not more than, what it would cost to car-pool. If rates go up more, there will be more car-pooling! This would overcrowd already crowded roads. This would go against everything we are preached to about safety at the site through VPP and WASP programs.

I have been riding the bus since 1988, I have always felt safe no matter what the road conditions because of the professional drivers we have.

I for one, and many others I have talked to, would be forced to car-pool if the rates were to increase as expected if the bus operations were privatized.

Lets keep safe and cost effective transportation available to site employees!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 48 (Code 67)

I don't think that privatizing the bus service is a good idea. We have an affordable and safe bus system now.

Any changes could cause many fatalities. I think that DOE should just "bite the bullet" and keep our current bus system. Keeping our VPP Star Status means that we must show our commitment to the safety of our employees. Please, think long and hard before going down the road to almost certain catastrophe.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 49 (Code 68)

I am currently a bus rider and am very concerned about the privatization of the bus service to the INEL, this plan will make it impossible for a technician to afford to ride the bus if the price goes much higher. I feel safe riding the bus and hate the idea of car pooling but see no other alternative. Please consider the accidents this change may cause. Thank You!

Response:

Section J, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. J

Question No. 50 (Code 69)

Subcontracting the INEL Bus Service I believe would be a great detriment to the INEL and also the employee. The safety of the employee should be number one. Hiring a new bus service leaves us wondering, how much will it cost?, who will be the driver? does this new driver have any experience on Idaho roads? am I as safe on the bus as I have been in the past? These are all major concerns to the average employee. We have fought to have Safety Number One and we would like to keep it that way.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. RF

Question No. 51 (Code 70)

I do like working here at the INEEL out on the Desert. I am glad that DOE have provide the Bus service in helping in the "SAFETY" on the HWY and roads to the INEEL. But I will be sad if DOE think that "Saving Money" is more important then the SAFETY of keeping the bus service at the INEEL. I see problem with security in having to check all vehicles at the main gates, parking at all Facilities, and road rage on the HWY to and from the INEEL site.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 52 (Code 71)

My comment is regarding the change in the bus service. I rode the bus the first two years I worked at the site and have carpooled for the past 12 years. I will not ride the bus for my health (the two years on the bus were the sickest years of my adult life) or the schedule. Is DOE prepared to vastly expand parking lots at the site if/when many people stop using the privatized bus service? With the lots go lighting costs and snow removal expenses. When I total my cost for a four-person carpool and the time I save each day, I'm making a profit compared to the bus. If the rates increase 50-150% (as rumored) so many people may not renew their passes that the service may go defunct. The issue of increased traffic on highways 20 & 26 is also a concern. There will be more mishaps, injuries, and probably fatalities. DOE will deserve some degree of fault for those incidents.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 53 (Code 72)

This is what I sent to DOE concerning the buses. I hope you take the time to send DOE your concerns.

I am concerned about the possibility of the INEEL buses being privatized. The present system is working great. It is a safe, efficient, low-cost operation. If everyone car-pooled to the site, you would have to build

parking lots (there are no parking places now). You would need to build an overpass for workers coming from Blackfoot and Pocatello on Highway 26. They would spend all day trying to get across Highway 20. The air quality would deteriorate. There would be more accidents. Privatization usually means increased prices. Because of this, I know that you would have a hard time getting people to stay working at the site (they would take the first job-opening in Idaho Falls that comes along). Site workers took a cut in pay two years ago when bus passes were introduced; we can't afford another one. In conclusion, increased cost will force people to car pool and it is safer riding the bus. Shouldn't the safety of your workers come first. It's just not a good or safe deal.

Feel free to copy this and send it to DOE. If we all send in something, at least we can say we tried.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 54 (Code 73)

COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS REGARDING BUS SERVICES AT THE INEEL:

It is unfortunate that DOE or BBWI does not "walk the talk." From as long as I can remember, the INEEL or INEL has been a champion and leader in safety first and foremost. Taking away the bus service or "privatizing" this service is an accident waiting to happen. An accident that will cost lives, money, and time. Lives and dismemberment of limbs cannot be replaced or substituted for money or economical reasons. The buses and qualified/ professional bus drivers have kept the INEEL safe for over 40 years. Taking away this service or giving it to someone else that does not have the "high" caliber that we have come to expect and hold in the highest regard, is an abomination to our safety record and the trust we have in our company and the VPP. It is a sad state of affairs when money is more important than a human life. I wonder how you would feel if you had to tell someone's little girl or boy that their father or mother was killed on the highway to work, because the bus service had been cancelled or given to someone else that did not have the principals that we use to have. If this happens, you deserve to lose the VPP Star status, and you will. I realize that company's are out to make money and profit, BUT at what COST!!!!!!!!! Try "walking the talk" for once.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 55 (Code 74)

As a member of the VPP EST team at the SMC project at Test area North I would like to express my dissatisfaction with the news of privatizing the Bus services. I honestly feel that a huge safety problem will arise with the number of cars on the road. I would have to think that hundreds, maybe thousands of lives have been spared by the bus service that we have had over the years here at the Ineel. Privatizing will increase the cost to the point that hundreds more cars will be on the road and fatalities will go up. Hopefully safety and lives are more important than money. I honestly believe that the bus services need to continue to be a site service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 56 (Code 75)

I think that privatizing the busses and cafeterias is a very bad plan. First of all the price would go up on bus transportation which means it's no longer beneficial to the people riding it. We would be spending almost as much in our own gas every week to drive our car. Most people will drive out which means you have several hundred more people on the road. I would be scared for my life whether or not I was riding the bus with that many people on those roads (HWY 20 and 26) This winter the few times I drove, there were already too many people on that road and people were driving recklessly and endangering others lives. This is simple physics folks, not more than one thing can be in one place at one time, but people try to test this theory in their cars and it leads to deaths and severe car wrecks. And telling them not to do it won't work because when is the last time you had several hundred people all obey a rule? There's a law against reckless driving already. Now

those people who can't afford to drive because of older vehicles or trucks that take up a ton of gas would ride the bus but those of us who don't make more than \$12 an hour will quit because we would be breaking even on our paychecks pretty much and it's just stupid to work somewhere that it costs you more to get there and come back then you are taking home. Either way YOU will lose your people. Through death or just plain leaving their jobs. Now the cafeterias, these people come from an hour or more away and there are no restaurants anywhere near here, the LEAST you could do is give them somewhere to eat and relax. Asking people to pack enough food for 2 meals out here is ridiculous. These people spend more time out here then they do with their families, 10-12 hour days, and 2 hours added to that for commuting. So these people give you 12-14 hours of their life every day. I would think you would at least provide them with this basic necessity. Especially when some people forget or don't have time to pack a lunch and rely on the cafeterias being here. I sincerely hope you change your minds on this.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 57 (Code 76)

Please do not outsource transportation services. Our current transportation services (INEEL Buses in particular) have an outstanding record of safe, convenient, and reliable transportation of employees to facilities. Why change to outsourcing, when the current transportation system provides reliability and safety for many employees during the dangerous winter seasons?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 58 (Code 77)

Please DO NOT privatize the bus operations for the INEEL. I believe this would be a mistake because a private company will not be very particular whom they hire for drivers. They would definitely increase the fares which would hurt me as I am a Secretary and don't have a high salary. Many others and I would be forced to drive and the traffic would be horrendous. My safety would be extremely compromised. If you care at all about the INEEL employees you will continue our bus operations as is.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 59 (Code 78)

I have a great concern, if you privatize the bus system. First that if! you find a company that will take the contract for that company to survive monetarily they will have to charge enough to ride the bus, we will find it cheaper to car pool. If we all car pool everyday it will create a hazardous situation on all three highways leading to the the Ineel that I fear will eventually cause injury and deaths. I sincerely hope you address these issues as you look to privatize the bus system , which I fear means doing away with it. I personally car pooled for 10 years working shift work it is no fun, expensive, and at times when you go to sleep at the wheel, Dangerous!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 60 (Code 79)

Please explain why DOE is privatizing the site commuter bus service and the expected changes in employee costs and usage. If a private business is to recover the cost of bus services and make a profit, the cost to site employees will undoubtedly increase. A cost increase would motivate more employees to drive personal vehicles. The resulting increase in commuter traffic would create congestion and safety issues on site access highways. In addition, it would increase fuel use, noise and pollutant emissions. These actions would contradict DOE's safety, conservation and environmental programs. I urge you to prepare an Environmental

Assessment to thoroughly evaluate bus service alternatives and their impacts before implementing this important decision.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 61 (Code 80)

The DOE ID RFP proposed privatization of the bus service for the INEEL, while a great cost reduction initiative, pose equal or greater safety risks which must be addressed.

1) Removal of evacuation bus service poses unacceptable safety risks in coordination and loss of control should private vehicles (povs) be the primary avenue of evacuation in an emergency event.

2) Current INEEL infrastructure is not constructed to accommodate the tremendous increase in traffic which would occur should the subsidized bus system be out sourced. Increased bus fare rates would shift the transportation dynamic to private vehicle usage. Parking and traffic accommodations are currently not available to handle the increased traffic flow.

3) Safety on the two lane highways leading to the INEEL is already a prime concern at peak hours with the subsidized bus service in place. Removing the bus service will send a message to all South Eastern Idaho and the nation that safety takes a back seat to cost savings at the INEEL (it will undoubtedly be proven by the increase in traffic incidence).

INEEL traffic superstructure was designed in the 1950's with the bus service in mind from evacuation procedures to access roads and parking facilities. Only a major redesign of the state and INEEL traffic superstructure could accommodate the realities caused by this proposal.

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 62 (Code 81)

Dear Sirs:

This morning it was brought to our attention that DOE is considering out sourcing the bus service to a private contractor in order to save money. While this may seem to be a good idea, the hidden costs in terms of the outcome of turning the bus service over to a private unsubsidized provider would, in all reality, be far greater than what you would realize in savings.

In addition to all the employees who work at INEEL, and serve their country by doing so, having to pay considerably higher commuting costs, there are other considerations that become important considerations. These include:

1) Increased traffic on Highway 20 and Highway 26 to a level the roads would not be able to handle safely. This would increase the costs to maintain the highways in a safe condition for the increased traffic.

2) There would be an appreciable increase in the number of traffic accidents and fatalities due to the increased daily traffic.

3) Almost everyone who works at INEEL has to commute over 50-60 miles or more each way. Most of us work a 9 to 12 hour day and many of us work additional hours in order to help meet work demands. Because of the distance we are required to commute to work each day, our "work" day is extended into a day that includes 2-3 hours of commuting time. Most of us use this commuting time to rest, which allows us to be more alert and attentive in our demanding and often risky jobs.

4) INEEL performs valuable research and maintains a complex system of facilities that requires strict adherence to rules and regulations that allow us to continue to operate safely and efficiently. Having a work force that is always alert and attentive to our responsibilities has allowed INEEL to operate in a safe manner for years with relatively few problems. This would most likely change if the work force was forced to drive to work in their personal cars.

5) Idaho is known for its weather, which can produce extremely hazardous driving conditions during the

winter months. The bus service, as it exists now, has allowed INEEL workers to commute to work in a safe manner.

6) In the 22 years I have worked at NRF, I have only driven to work on a few occasions. Even though I have ridden the bus most of the time, I have not been immune to some of the problems I have described. Just this past winter I fell asleep while driving home from work and slid off the road. I was fortunate that neither I nor my passenger was hurt. It could have had a very different ending. I might not have been lucky enough to be able to drive back on to the road and continue home.

7) Everyone I know at work is aware of someone who has had an accident while commuting to work. Every day we pass crosses noting the spot where someone on Highway 20 or 26 was killed in a traffic accident. How many more crosses will be placed along side the highway if traffic is increased a hundred fold?

8) INEEL has served the United States and the people of Idaho for over fifty years. All the employees at the various sites care about their jobs, care about the work we are asked to do, and care about maintaining INEEL as a safe place to work. More importantly, we care about continuing to help INEEL play an important role in developing the programs which will ultimately benefit everyone in the United States.

9) One other consideration is the ultimate affect on the environment. Placing hundreds of additional automobiles on the two highways every day not only increases fuel consumption and pollution, you have the additional hidden and not so hidden costs of wear and tear on the automobiles used by INEEL workers commuting to work. It will not take long for automobiles to wear out and have to be replaced at 120 miles or more a day.

I guess what I am trying to say is there are a lot of hidden costs and other things to consider in making your decision. Ultimately, I would hope you would look at all of the issues, even the ones that are not as obvious, and come up with a win/win decision. Turning the bus service over to private contractors may seem like the right thing to do, but when you add up all of the costs as I have outlined, you would quickly loose whatever savings you sought in the first place.

I hope you will consider these points in making your decision.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 63 (Code 83)

I am concerned about the privatization of the bus service. We currently have a great system that is also very safe. If it is changed, chances are that the roads will become more congested, thus less safe. I am also concerned about the additional costs.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 64 (Code 84)

This contract should contain specific wording in reference to transportation services and how it is to be managed. It seems to be apparent that transportation services will be subcontracted out. However there is no guidelines as to control of excessive costs to employees or significant issues with parking at each of the facilities if costs do rise, causing a increase in employees driving out to work.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 65 (Code 85)

I am concerned about subcontracting the bus services and its impact safe travel on the highway. Highway 20 is not designed for the amount of traffic that would be generated due to employees reverting to personal vehicles due to increased bus ride costs. Additionally,an increase in bus ticket cost to me as a rider is a reduction to my take home pay and a reduced standard of living which will affect my decision to continue

employment with the INL.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 66 (Code 86)

I am writing to express my concerns with potential privatizing/outsourcing of the INL bus fleet. I will have been employed here 25 years this September. Of one thing I am certain should the decision be made to outsource or privatize the bus service is that many more people will be pushed to making a decision to drive versus use the buses. The current bus fleet has a nearly impeccable record of safety. If you allow it to be privatized or changed a tremendous fee increase is inevitable then people will choose to start their own car pools or drive solo. This is not conversation, it is not safe, and I fear many lives of INL employees will be put at risk. Why? Because some people are just idiots when it comes to driving and the highway out here will become unsafe. I don't want to here that my counterpart or someone else was again killed on the highway today when their car rolled, slid off the road in winter, or was hit by someone else trying to pass someone. It is truly inevitable that this will happen.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 67 (Code 87)

I am deeply concerned about DOE's intention to provatize or outsource the bus operation. I am a daily bus rider to and from the site for almost seven years now, ever since I started working at the INEEL. I came to appreciate very much the bus service I've enjoyed during that period of time. I found the existing bus operation is reliable, safe, convenient and inexpensive. The company bus drivers are dedicated professionals who take their jobs very seriously. It does not make sense to me to introduce major changes to something that has been working very well and that has been tested over many years and through many site contractors. It is my hope that the DOE will take these facts into serious consideration in making final decisions on whether to privatize the bus operations.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 68 (Code 88)

I have alot of questions on how this can be feasible and ran across a fellow worker statement. I have used this statement because I feel it address's my concerns. Thanks

I am concerned about the possibility of the INEEL buses being privatized. The present system is working great. It is a safe, efficient, low-cost operation. If everyone car-pooled to the site, you would have to build parking lots (there are no parking places now). You would need to build an overpass for workers coming from Blackfoot and Pocatello on Highway 26. They would spend all day trying to get across Highway 20. The air quality would deteriorate. There would be more accidents. Privatization usually means increased prices. Because of this, I know that you would have a hard time getting people to stay working at the site (they would take the first job-opening in Idaho Falls that comes along). Site workers took a cut in pay two years ago when bus passes were introduced; we can't afford another one. In conclusion, increased cost will force people to car pool and it is safer riding the bus. Shouldn't the safety of your workers come first. It's just not a good or safe deal.

Response:

Section E, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 69 (Code 89)

I am concerned about the quality and safety aspects of outsourcing Safeguards and Security and Bus Operations. It has been my experience that subcontracting those services directly responsible for the welfare and protection of employees results in a poorer quality of service and level of protection(subcontractors are

often out to line their pockets at the expense of the employee) and a degradation of safety goals and performance. I would hate to see this happen since the INEEL has worked hard to achieve an outstanding safety and performance record.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 2.4

Question No. 70 (Code 90)

INEEL Site Transportation Privatization Comment

The DOE decision to privatize the transportation system to the INEEL is a poorly conceived idea to save money. It ignores the DOE commitment to safety that it has tried to instill into the work force at the INEEL. Becoming a STAR site and adherence to VPP principals to safety were good ideas to promote, but the decision to privatize the bus system to the site sends the message that safety is not a priority for DOE.

It has been stated that management has determined that one to five fatalities per year will occur with the change in bus service. This was an acceptable number to them, but it is not to the work force. It is naïve to think that all the workers currently riding the buses will ride the privatized service. The privatized system will not have the number of riders the current system has. Convenience, increased costs, change in access location and other factors will force many workers to use their private vehicles to drive to the site and increase the risk of accident or fatality to the site work force. In any case, it demonstrates that DOE is not as committed to safety as it would want us to believe. This is not the right message to send to the work force. If DOE only gives lip service to safety, the commitment of the work force to safety will surely decline.

The privatization of the bus service will put an increased load on the highway system to the site facilities. The increase in traffic will result in an increase in accidents and fatalities. The current transportation system has an excellent safety record, and we as a work force are appreciative of what it has accomplished. The road to the site from Idaho Falls and Blackfoot is not designed for the peak increase in traffic. Idaho weather in the winter is severe and greatly increases the risk to the driver especially with the increase in number of vehicles using the road. All of these items are precursors to an accident. The accidents will happen and valuable workers will be injured or killed. Is DOE really willing to accept this responsibility?

DOE has the ability to not expose the work force to these increased hazards by not privatizing the bus service at the INEEL. I would ask DOE to reconsider privatizing the INEEL transportation system to the site. I know this service is a unique service, but the needs of the INEEL are unique. DOE has had a long-standing commitment to the transportation system at the INEEL and to the safety of the INEEL worker. It is sad to see this commitment disregarded and is not a change DOE is required to make. Don't make this change.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 71 (Code 91)

The bus operations at the INEEL are satisfactory as they stand. It has been confirmed that you have intentions of moving this program to a private business. Why fix something that is not broken? I urge you to reconsider this action and ensure that the bus personnel maintain their current employment status.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 72 (Code 92)

I've been a passenger on the Bus for the past 15 years, and ride not only because of the cost savings, but because of safety issues. I can't believe with all the accidents we have had that we might be forced to drive our cars to get to work. This is not only a financial hardship on most of us, but a lot of us do not have the maintenance safe vehicle for this type of driving. This could put many of us out of work, or if we are forced to drive, jeopardize the lives of not only ourselves but many others on the road. If the price of rides becomes so

prohibitive we can't afford to ride the bus any longer and are forced onto the roads, it would be quite clear that SAFETY is indeed NOT the INL's top priority.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 73 (Code 93)

I am concerned about the bus outsourcing. I live in Pocatello and to either car pool or drive in the winter or other inclement weather conditions will be very hazardous. Not only will the roads be bad, but there will be a considerable amount of traffic. Accidents will be on a increase affecting both work loads and attendance. Outsourcing will also have an effect on personnal budgets and some people may not be able to afford the higher rates.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 74 (Code 94)

I am concerned about the changes in the bus transportation to the site. The roads are very dangerous and over traveled as it is. I would rather stay home than drive if I miss the bus during the winter. If the cost goes up, we would not have any choice but to car pool which means hundreds of more people on the roads. Lives are going to be lost. This not only affects the people who work at the site but the vacationers and non site workers that travel that road. Please review this change very seriously.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 75 (Code 95)

Comment: In response to the INEEL buses being privatized: I think bus service at the iINEEL should remain as it is. It is one thing that is done well and people are pleased with the service. Cutting any bus service could greatly effect the working person's ability to travel the distance to the site.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 76 (Code 96)

I appreciate the bus service that is provided by the INEEL presently. Without the service, I would have to drive 75 miles one way. I feel safe when I only have to drive 25 miles to catch the bus. My day starts at 4:00 AM and doesn't end until 7:10 PM. With the increase in traffic and loss of sleep because of having to drive to work... I can see an increase in accidents and general safety issues at work too because of lack of sleep. Please don't compromise safety by changing a system that works. Our lives depend on it.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 77 (Code 97)

I am concerned about the bus outsourcing. If the bus service is privatized and the fares go too high it will force people into driving. This will result in an increase in accidents. Without as much traffic on the roads now it is still not safe in the winter to drive. I hope we will be able to keep a safe, efficient and reasonable cost transportation system operating for everyone's safety.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 78 (Code 98)

Privatizing Bus Operations will not only put a great group of reliable drivers out of work, it will increase the number of deaths and injuries on Highway 20 because more people will be driving. Frankly, it is unAmerican.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 79 (Code 99)

I don't understand why try and fix something that's not broke!!!! The safety record of the busses and big shop with all the awards in your eyes mean nothing. I for one, after 32 years of riding the busses would like to see it left alone.. I'am sure if you do change it will mean more cost to employee's and not as safe, or dependable on time. Leave it alone.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 80 (Code 100)

I have been a bus rider for 8 years. As an employee concerned with safety, it has been a relief knowing the commute to my work site has been safe because of the bus service. To subcontract out the bus service would be taking away the safety of so many employees, because most people would be forced to drive because of increase costs. I don't know that the highways can handle such a large volume of commuters not to mention the safety has been compromised particularly in the winter months.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 81 (Code 101)

Being a bus rider and setting watching some of the cars on the road and the way they drive I'm very thankful to have a professional drive at the wheel and to know that he/she will get me to my destination safely. I would like very much to see our bus service continue and know that any of my friends are family that use the INEEL Bus will get to and from work safely. Really look at the amount of lives that will be at jeporday if you outsource the transportation system that we have now. Have you ever ridden the bus and linton to some of the problems thatthey take care of on a daily basics.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 82 (Code 102)

In the name of safety the buss service needs to be left intact and supported by DOE.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 83 (Code 103)

In my opinion outsourcing the bus service is in direct oposition to the safety culture that the site has tried so hard to impliment. Any company that takes over the bus service will need to make a profit. That will likely require a price increase. The cost of bus service to the employee is very near the point at which car pooling becomes cost effective. Any increase in price will likely increase the number of cars on the roadways. Anyone who drives to the site knows that the roads can not handle the additional year round traffic. There are bound to be more accidents and fatalities as already crowded roadways get an influx of drivers. We work so hard to reduce the hazards to employees at work but now are basicly telling everyone we don't really care if you get killed or injured on your way to work. Think about how many times have we heard that the most dangerous part of our work day is getting here.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 84 (Code 104)

This comment is concerning the out sourcing of the bus operations for the INL. In my opinion it would be a great mistake to out source bus ops. The bus ops program is one of envy by many others. The INL should be proud of the current bus ops. The drivers take pride in what they do. The fleet of buses are dependable, reliable, comfortable, and very safe. By out sourcing the bus ops, who is to say what the conditions may be. Another concern of mine is the cost. Currently I feel that the cost is very competitive, and money well spent. With out sourcing, the price will certainly raise discouraging people to ride. Thus forcing more traffic on highways 20 and 26, that do not even accomidate for the amount of traffic at the present time. I see NO advantages by out sourcing the bus operations.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 85 (Code 105)

I understand from the RFP that DOE is planning to outsource the BUS SERVICE. I would like to respectfully ask that DOE reconsider this decision and keep our Bus Service for many reasons. First of all in order for a for profit company to be able to run the buses, they are going to have to charge us busriders quite a bit more to make that profit. If they charge me more that I already am paying, I will probably opt to drive instead. This brings up the second issue which is SAFETY. Not that "I" am THE unsafe driver, but when you have 1000's of cars on the Arco Highway driving out and back in day by day....it is an accident waiting to happen. All it would take is a couple of accidents and deaths of ICP or INL employees and the issue would become clear. Thirdly, if the majority of people are driving where are they going to park? I work at INTEC and as it is now, our parking lot is full and all the buses are full. So where are all the people who are now driving because they do not have affordable bus service going to park? Money would have to be spent to enlarge the parking lots. The common errors that people make while driving that highway are plentiful as it is, try multiplying that and see what happens. Everyone drives at a different speed. The slow ones are causing the speed limit drivers to pass and the ones who are in a great hurry to get home pass all of them. We have a bus service in place that is dependable, safe and affordable. I urge DOE to not outsource our bus service. Sincerely,

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 86 (Code 106)

I bekieve that the site transportation requirements will be best satisfied by a continuation of the current bus system. I firmly believe that privatization of that service will result in a great decline in quality, efficiency, reliabilty, and safety. I believe that costs for riders will also increase. I would suggest reconsidering the privatization of this service. It is one of the few "perks" that those of us who travel to the site daily enjoy. I'd hate to lose it. Thank you.

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 87 (Code 107)

Everyone that I know at Argonne would like to keep our safe, efficient, and low-cost bus transportation system. The buses help cut down the amount of traffic on the road to the site and greatly lower fatal traffic accidents from a too crowded narrow Hwy, bad roads, and impatient or sleepy drivers . They greatly aid our desperately energy-short economy as they prevent nearly everyone having to drive their own car to work. Riding the bus actually is an incentive or pay bonus to help extend employees paychecks as driving to work everyday is a big expense and alot of wear and tear added to personal vehicles. It sure would be a wonderful

and great thing if we could keep our current bus mode of travel to work at the INEEL. It has been so wonderful. I don't think that any of us have appreciated it nearly enough!

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 88 (Code 108)

I am writing this in regard to the proposal in the RFP for the new INL. I understand that DOE intends to do away with the current bus service. They are talking of privatizing the bus service. I doubt that a private company could provide transportation to the INL at a reasonable cost. This will certainly lead to more traffic on US highways 20 and 26.

I understand that this has happened at the Hanford site. The conditions in Idaho are not the same as in Washington. There is not a 4-lane highway to the INL. We have much more inclement weather in southeast Idaho than the tri-city area of Washington which leads to more snow and ice on the highways. The distance to travel is much greater here than that for the Hanford employees.

I believe that there will be a dramatic increase in accidents and the loss of life due to this change. DOE and BBWI talk of safety and it being a high priority but this and other things that are done make it appear as if the talk of safety is no more than lip service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 89 (Code 109)

Please leave the bus service as is. If the bus fee is increased so that everyone drives out here to the site, accidents will occur and time from our jobs will result.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 90 (Code 110)

It's real nice to provide opportunities to a couple of handfulls of small local / regional businesses. that will make them wealthier but in the process thousands of regular loyal employees will be taking pay cuts and benefit cuts to retain there jobs if givin the oportunity to retain them, ref. C.2.3.c INL-RFP. Why not use plane english and say that DOE wants to save money and have their prime contractors have less responsibiliy, and DOE and the Prime contractors don't really care how it affects thousands of people who work for the INL, When all you have to do is demand that you're prime contractor minimize waste in management and the way they do daily business, When someone has to work for a sub-contractor of a sub-contractor for less money and benifits, chances are that they won't be enthusiastic about how well they do there jobs, pride won't be much of a factor for the employee's because they don't have a hand in the business, we won't be directly associated with the mission at the INL, I guess the good of the few outweighs the good of the many.

I hope someone is really lisening to our comments.
Thanks

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 91 (Code 111)

I do not understand why it would be better to have another contractor take over Bus Operations. Bus Operations is one system that is working, so why take them away? It is claimed to be too expensive for the DOE, but look at the waste that goes on here every day. Unnecessary paperwork, signatures from the bottom

to the top, stuff that is excessed, hours wasted by indecisions, meetings that are expensive and unnecessary. I would think money could be saved and also time by taking care of the waste that goes on. The bus drivers are excellent drivers; know the area as well, and the most important part -- know the weather. Yes, people could drive like some other contractors at the site presently do, but these people make a lot more money and can afford to drive. Wouldn't it make better sense to let them and everyone that wants to, to ride the bus? I'm sure money could be made this way. I feel that we are being divided as a working class at the site. Those that are subcontractors make more money so they drive; the other persons that work for BBWI ride the bus. I think making it harder for people to get to work and especially bringing outside people in would be another blow to the people of the Site and the area. If it's not broke, why do you have to fix it? It seems all you are doing is dividing the working people into two groups. The rich who are the drivers and the poor who are the riders.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 92 (Code 112)

We have a wonderful bus service and I feel like the employee's would be getting their throats cut if we were to do away with it. Adding more stress and strife to everyone's lives. This is not a broken system, so why should we break it.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 93 (Code 113)

I am concerned about safety and personal cost increase if privatization of bus service occurs. When costs increase, people will drive instead, filling the highway with cars, increasing commute time and reducing safety.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 94 (Code 114)

Have you ever driven to the site at 6 a.m. or 5:30 p.m. It is one long line of traffic with some that are more than anxious to reach their destination before anyone else. It is so dangerous now that I cannot imagine what it would be like with twice as many cars on the road. If the buses are privatized and the rates rise again, most of us people will be forced to drive. Our bus drivers are the best. They provide us safe passageway to and from work. They actively care about their passengers. What a mistake it is to try to fix something that isn't broken.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 95 (Code 115)

I think it is a mistake to privatize bus operations at the site. this would affect safety on roads that are already overdriven by private vehicles. it would cause even more private vehicles to be driven on this road, due to increase costs and poorer bus service.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 96 (Code 116)

I HAVE ONE QUESTION ABOUT OUR PRESENT SITUATION OUT HERE AT THE SITE RIGHT NOW, WHEN IT COMES TO DOE AND BECHTEL, DOES THE TAIL WAG THE DOG, OR DOES THE DOG WAG THE TAIL???? TO OUT-SOURCE/PRIVITIZE THE BUSSING, CAFETERIA, AND SECURITY MAKES NO SENSE AT ALL. SO DOES DOE WANT TO CLAIM THIS BRIGHT IDEA, OR DOES BECHTEL?? PEOPLES

LIVES DEPEND ON THE NEARLY ACCIDENT FREE BUSSING SYSTEM WE HAVE AT PRESENT, VERSES THE ALREADY OVERLOADED HIGHWAY SYSTEM. MORE PRIVATE VEHICLES ON THESE HIGHWAYS GAURANTEES DEATHS TO INEEL EMPLOYEES AND PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS. OUTSOURCING SECURITY HAS ALREADY BEEN TRIED OUT HERE AND IT WAS A JOKE. AND FOR MANY FUTURE YEARS OUT AT THE SITE, IT ONLY MAKES SENSE TO LEAVE THE FOOD SERVICE SYSTEM AS IT IS. OUTSIDE SERVICES WOULD HAVE TO VIRTUALLY TRY TO COPY THE EXISTING WAY OF DOING BUISNESS, SO WHY CHANGE IT?? LET'S JUST GET SOME PROJECTS OUT HERE, PUT US ALL TO WORK AND LEAVE THINGS ALONE THAT DO NOT NEED TO BE CHANGED.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 101 (Code 121)

I have heard rumors that there is intention of having the bus operations subcontracted to a private firm with the new contract (INL). I do not feel this is in the best interest of the site. The bus system seems to work just fine with the drivers and the established routes. I would worry about the safety issues. Privatization for profit would cause the bus ticket prices to go up. People would drive more. With more vehicles driving out everyday, bus routes would decrease. Long and irregular hours, tired employees, bad winter roads, long commute distances, more traffic would seem to cause a increase of traffic related accidents and deaths. With the site being so "safety" minded, I feel that privatizing the bus service would be absurd. The bus system is one of the very few comforts of having to work so far away from civilization. Without it, many people will chose to work elsewhere.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 105 (Code 125)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 206

Question No. 106 (Code 126)

We get up very early to be to work at 6:45 am and the bus service that we have is relide upon for saftey and a period for relaxation to catch up on the lack of sleep that we receive everyday because of the long commute. Those roads a not designed for that many cars to be on at once. It would be a very deadly thing to expose not only our lives but the lifes of others ,If it works good leave it alone !!! If money is a fact get it from somplace else !! Leave our bus service and the drivers alone !!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 107 (Code 127)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 108 (Code 128)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 109 (Code 129)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 110 (Code 130)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 111 (Code 131)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 112 (Code 132)

I'm sending this as a safety concern, if the buses are privatized and the cost of transportation goes up substantially, many employees will elect to car pool. This puts several hundred cars on Hwy. 20/26, which scares me. I have been an employee of the INEEL for over 20 years and have seen many near misses and fatalities on the state roads. I assume the State is going to have to make adjustments to ensure the Hwy. is maintained and patrolled properly with the additional traffic...it seems to be creating a major safety problem and generally, a bad situation. I respectfully, request you take a second look at your decision and do the right thing, I think the employees are worth it.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 113 (Code 133)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 114 (Code 134)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 115 (Code 135)

Do not privatize the bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 116 (Code 136)

I feel that it would be devastating to change bus operation because of the traffic situation. More cars, more traffic, more accidents...

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 117 (Code 137)

I understand that the RFP does not address bus services or cafeteria food services. It seems to me that you are trying to dismantle the site one organization at a time. I can only imagine the extreme danger you would place people in by putting that many cars on Hwy's 20 & 26 each day in place of the busses. If you truly believe in safety as you claim, this would be a poor way to actually show it. Food services have always provided an essential niche for people who don't take their own lunches. Even though I think they are somewhat over priced, they provide an essential service for people who are anywhere from 20 to 80 miles from home. I've been employed at the site for over 26 years and it is a sacrifice that only those who work there can understand. We need these above mentioned services to continue to be a part of that sacrifice, to help maintain our safety and attitude.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 118 (Code 138)

I'm concerned of the proposed privatizing of bus service to the INEEL. The cost increase may prohibit many from riding thus choosing to drive their own vehicles. The extra traffic on the roadways invariably will result in more accidents and possible deaths. The safest and most cost effective means of travel is by bus with ticket prices attractive to passengers. Less traffic saves lives, resources, and reduces carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere. Subcontracting places our lives in the hands of "monetary transportation", not "safety transportation". Please do not subcontract the bus service.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 119 (Code 139)

I m concerned that the privatization of the transportation system at INL will greatly increase the costs of riding the bus. This will increase the highway traffic for private vehicles and subsequently increase traffic accidents. THANKS

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 120 (Code 140)

I am opposed to privatizing the guards, cafeteria services and bus operations at the INEEL. Unfortunately, the rhetoric extolling the benefits of privatization has been spouted so often that many people have come to accept and believe it as fact. Very few people actually question if privatization will actually benefit the operation or the people served. In my experience, I have not seen any operation where privatization has produced a better operation. Additionally, privatization will end up costing everyone more in money and safety.

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 121 (Code 141)

My comments are in response to the RFP calling for privatization of the bus service. I ride the bus everyday because it is safe and reliable. If it is privatized the cost will surely rise, making it cheaper to drive private vehicles. Putting hundreds more vehicles on the 2 state highways leading to the Site will be a hazard both to the farmers and residents who live along the road as well as Site employees. Nearly every night on the way home we get behind a piece of farm machinery. That makes people impatient trying to get home. Our drivers are skilled and get us home on time no matter what. It would make more sense to cut the waste caused by inept management decisions that to continue to extract more and more from the workers. I will give you an example. At TAN a perfectly good building that could have been used to house offices was demolished to meet a milestone. Now they are going to bring in trailers to house people, requiring hooking up utilities. The demolition took 2 days. It could easily have been moved back on the schedule. Privatizing bus service will not save money. It will just change the source of the money from DOE to the workers. In April, our VPP Star status flag will be replaced. A better idea would be to take it down and burn it as a demonstration of the true emphasis DOE puts on worker safety vs. the almighty dollar. I am a taxpayer and I vote.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 122 (Code 142)

My comment concerns the intent to privatize the bus operations. I started working full time at the NRTS more than 36 years ago and have worked more than half of that time on site using the bus system almost exclusively for my commute. I ride the bus every work day now. To maintain morale of site workers (another intent of the RFP) you need to ensure that the quality and level of service are maintained and that more disparity is not imposed on site workers. As it is, we are paid no more for the 2 1/2 to 3 hours every day that we must spend in the commute that our coworkers in town do not have to spend. I would hope that the new contract with the drivers, mechanics, and other people working in the transportation system will protect their benefits, pay level, etc. This should not be a problem if the real intent for the change is to allow the new site contractors to focus on the DOE work and not just a way to save money. It should be obvious that it will be much more difficult to recruit people to work at the ICP of INL if they are faced with a more expensive or less professional system than we currently have. It is difficult, as is, to get people to voluntarily work at the site when there are so many people working in town who do not have to ride the bus. The bus ride is not too bad but anything that is done on the bus can be more comfortably done at home. So it is really just time that must be spent away from our families that our "towney" coworkers don't have to give up.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 123 (Code 143)

I strongly object to privatization of the bus services. One of the most dangerous things to do is to drive on the icy Idaho roads. If we are concerned with safety, we should be doing every thing possible to encourage people to use the bus services. Like all privatization ventures, reduction of service is the result. This will result in more people driving, instead of taking the bus to work. I would like to see our tax paying dollars go into actual safety and not safety propaganda programs. Walk the walk!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 124 (Code 144)

I think it would not be a good thing to go away from our present bus service, they have an excellent safety record and prices that the employees are willing to pay. If the bus service is sub contracted with a large increase in fees the highways to the site will become more dangerous than they already are.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 125 (Code 145)

I am very concerned about DOE's intention (draft RFP) to privatize the very safe and reliable bus operations at the INEEL which will likely result in greatly increased private vehicle traffic on highways 20 and 26 (already a serious safety issue). We as employees can practice ISMS, VPP, and qualify for Star status but that won't make much difference if DOE compromises our safety on our commute to the site just to save a few bucks. So what is a life worth? Let's keep the present bus transportation system.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 126 (Code 146)

I am concerned with the idea that our bus service may be privatized. I have been at NRF for almost 20 years and I would like to think that the company's that contract these facilities care about the working community's safety and convenience. If the bus service is compromised by privatizing it, it would be one more example of the company's cutting back at the workers' expense.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 127 (Code 147)

I couldn't find any reference to the bus services provided to site personnel in the RFP. However, I have heard repeated mention of privatizing the bus operations. I, as well as many other people, believe that this would be a huge mistake. The first issue is whether or not the state roads can support the additional traffic. Secondly, I can't say enough about how much safety is pushed at the site. By adding hundreds of more cars to the road, the accident rate would show an extensive increase. We are also an environmental agency (temporarily as it may be) and the environmental impact on the animals and the atmosphere would be substantial. There are many more problems that could arise with privatizing the bus operations at the INL. Please consider all of these concerns when making a decision.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 128 (Code 149)

I would like to express my concern over the plan to privatize the bus operations at the INEEL. I believe that the decrease in safety from having many more drivers on the road due to the probably higher bus riding costs is a major concern. Lost productivity due to workers being more tired at work from driving out to the site would more than offset any potential savings to DOE.

Thanks for listening.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 129 (Code 150)

I would like it to be reconsidered to have the bus service to the site privatized. I am a regular rider on the bus system now. I feel it is a safe, efficient way to get to work. There is already a great amount of traffic on the road. It is common to have close calls with accidents. I feel it will become a major safety problem if it is not cost effective to ride the bus. The road cannot handle the traffic now and many more cars will be on the road if it is outsourced. This will also make it harder to get to work in a timely manner. Please reconsider this.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 1a

Question No. 130 (Code 151)

Regarding the outsourcing of Bus Operations.

I believe that this is a bad move. Privatization of the bus operations will certainly drive costs to the rider up.

This will create more drivers and more accidents. It will also decrease service. By keeping the bus operations part of the INEEL, the cost can be kept down, and there will be fewer accidents, and fatalities.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

I'm sure there are many more reasons why the bus operations should be as they are, but most important to me is the service and cost.

Thank you

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 131 (Code 152)

I disagree with the Idea to privatize the bus service!! Why don't you cut waste instead of something that is working? I see a lot of time and money being wasted in other areas, like pit 9 and new facilities like the fire department. Why cut something that is working and is a total benefit to those loyal hard working people that serve. Why is it the people that have to always pay for corporate cuts? Please re-think this and leave the professionalism that already exists in our bus service alone!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 132 (Code 153)

My understanding is that the RFP may include the attempted privatization of the bus service to the INEEL. I as an employee would be totally dissatisfied if the cost skyrockets higher than it already is. There would definitely be issues concerning the extra traffic on highway 20/26 to and from the site. Rush hours on this stretch are already dangerous. Is this an attempt to push people from riding the buses and getting rid of the mass transit which has provided safe economical transportation to the site all these years? It's amazing that a lot of employees have to hear about this proposal in other than company correspondence.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 133 (Code 154)

The INEEL bus drivers distributed a notice identifying DOE's intent to privatize the bus operations. I am opposed to privatizing the bus operations. For the 29 years I have worked on the INEEL, bus operations have provided safe, efficient, and low cost transportation between the Site and home. The bus operations have become an institution. Outsourcing the bus operations is likely to increase the cost to make such a venture profitable. The bus driver have distributed information identifying other possible effect of outsourcing, all negative. It's not clear to me that outsourcing offers a single advantage to the people who ride the bus. I am against outsourcing the bus operations.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 134 (Code 155)

We are told that DOE-INL has a good budget this year. Why are they trying to privatize our great safe bus system. There has never been a fatality in the 27 years I have been riding the bus. There are many fatalities every year in cars. Add several hundred more cars to the highway due to a privatized bus services high prices, and 20/26 will become a killing machine. Parking will be a mess. There is already over-crowding at intake, traffic, and most other area. Hard to park on the west side of town also. Is anyone thinking this thing out first? Please think through this important decision before you act. We have one of the best and safest bus systems in the U.S. Lets don't throw it away. Keep this site a great safe place to work. Thanks for this opportunity to express my concerns.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 135 (Code 156)

It is my feeling that we need our buses running just as they are. We have excellent drivers, and a fare we can live with. It would be a big safety issue to change to any other way.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 137 (Code 158)

I am concerned about the desire of DOE to out source the bus system at INEEL. I feel the cost will be more expensive or it may be too inconvenient, than it would be to drive therefore most people will drive. Then they will say "we don't need busses any more". That makes a very unsafe condition on these roads. If enough benefits are taken away, it is hard to encourage people to stay or bring in new people. Is it DOE's intent to make everyone angry enough to quit?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 138 (Code 159)

How can DOE push for safety and VPP and take away the bus service? How can DOE require EEO and not put security out for bid? DOE seems to require one thing of its employees and another for them. I also think all employees should have to work at the site for at least a year before they are allowed to make decisions they know nothing about. Town employees that have to come to work for one day out here should have to report at 7:00 AM instead of leaving town at 7:00 AM and they should have to stay until 5:30 PM instead of leaving at 4:00 or earlier to make it back by 5:00. Maybe then they would be able to get a glimpse of the traffic situation.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 139 (Code 160)

My comment concerns privatization of the bus service to the INEEL. The bus service, as it is now operated, has been a great benefit to employees, not only financially, but as a safe and reliable mode of transportation to the INEEL.

I am concerned that privatization will make the cost of riding the bus prohibitive to many employees who will then resort to driving their own cars or joining car pools. The number of cars on the highways between Idaho Falls, Blackfoot, and Pocatello and the INL will increase considerably, resulting in an increased safety risk for employees.

I would vote to keep the existing bus service to continue providing a safe and reliable mode of transportation for INL employees.

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 1

Question No. 140 (Code 161)

I like the bus system the way it is! The bus drivers are safe and courteous. The price is right, too.

Outsourcing the bus system does not seem like a good idea. I vote to keep it the way it is. Thank you.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 141 (Code 162)

It is my opinion that privatization of the bus services at the INEEL will have numerous negative results, e.g., bus ticket costs would more likely rise, people would drive their own private vehicles more thus causing more traffic and increased safety risks, there would possibly be a reduction in routes in order to reduce bus service provider costs, and regular re-bidding would cause multiple upsets and changes to what is a complex and I believe essential service to the INEEL. Without guaranteed measures being in place to safeguard the general employee from these negative possibilities, I believe privatizing the bus services would have costly and negative effect both to the INEEL infrastructure and its many employees. I rely heavily on this service to get to and from work. The current bus services is extremely reliable, courteous, and safe.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 143 (Code 164)

This is concerning the privatizing of the bus operations. This sounds like another in a long line of ??? ideas.

If this happens, the price to ride the bus will probably double. You think the hi-way traffic is bad now.

Everybody loses; less money in our pockets, more dead people on the hi-way and eventually the buses quit because there are no riders. The bottom line is \$\$\$\$\$. How much can we save. In my opinion, that is tax money you are saving. Taxes that I paid and I would like to use the money I paid. LEAVE THE BUS OPERATION THE WAY IT IS !!!!!!!

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 144 (Code 165)

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the prospect of outsourcing the bus services. I feel the outcome of that type of decision will be the loss of life as more people take to driving their own cars to cut costs. Let's use some common sense on this issue and not let the bottom line make a poor decision for the entire site.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 145 (Code 166)

This comment addresses the DOE intention to privatize cafeteria services and bus operations at the INEL. I have worked at TRA for the past twelve years. Beginning with the contract change from EG&G to Lockheed and continuing till the present time, there seems to have been a shift in the DOE philosophy toward many INEL site services.

Traditionally, the people who have traveled the sixty-plus miles each day, each way in order to support the various DOE missions, have been provided safe, low cost transportation, and outstanding, reasonably priced food service on site (there is not always time to fix lunch at 4:45am).

The attitude of DOE has changed from providing these services at a subsidized rate, as a built-in benefit in exchange for extra 500 hours of drive time we spend each year, to acting like every site service should be a profit center for the contractor. The net result is that the Workers shoulder all of the burden of budget cuts, rather than instituting efficiencies that DOE touts publicly. When you consider the increased costs in the past

decade for food services (more than double), bus service (triple, when holidays and vacation are considered), benefits (QUADRUPLED), my pay has not kept pace with inflation ---- I am working and supporting the DOE mission for less money now than ever, even with promotions and pay raises. Now we hear that cafeteria services are going to be privatized, the sure result of which will be more price hikes. I would be surprised if the cafeterias would continue to operate unless the contractor was given a significant subsidy to operate. The estimates that we are hearing for bus fares indicate that a private operator would charge \$48 per week in order to operate profitably, which would shut the operation down. Is that the unstated goal that DOE has? I would not pay \$48 per week for bus service --- no one would. DOE would save some money and it would be made up, once again, on the backs AND WITH THE LIVES of site employees. DOE would be placing 300-500 additional cars on highways 20 & 26 every day. What do your actuaries tell you about anticipated increased accident rates and deaths per year? Will you save more money than it will cost in class action lawsuits? I wonder.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 147 (Code 168)

The RFP indicates that the bus operations at the INEEL will be privatized. This creates a concern of not only a financial one to INEEL employees, but most importantly, a safety one. The current cost of bus transportation is reasonable. To have this operation assumed by a private company, the cost will increase substantially. This will force many employees to drive. The traffic on the highways to the site will be substantial and the safety issues great. Driving these distances daily in personal vehicles, or even several times a week, will result in fatigued employees, which also becomes a safety concern not only at work, but also on their ways to and from work. Outsourcing bus operations would be detrimental to the safety of INEEL employees. Please rethink this decision. Keep the bus operations part of the contract.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 148 (Code 169)

I am really concerned about the awarding of "side" contracts without a bid process or information about what the details are.(ie, bus service, safeguards & security) It seems to reflect negatively on the integrity and safety of new INL and DOE

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 149 (Code 170)

I am writing concerning the intended change in bus transportation.

I am against the concept of bus service being given to private vendors. Private vendors will have to raise the price of each ride to turn a profit. This will increase traffic on highways 20 and 26. This will not only increase the hazard of travel to and from work, but will also increase the security risks associated with heavier travel onto the site.

The bus drivers do a fine job of providing safe, affordable transportation. There are numerous times throughout the year that if I were driving myself I would stay home due to hazardous road conditions.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 150 (Code 171)

I am concerned with the safety issue concerning the bus transportation issue and would appreciate continued, affordable transportation. Is there provision for transportation in the contract and would it be government

supported?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 151 (Code 173)

I do not believe that the Bus services should be privatized. The increased cost will cause people to stop using the buses, which will make running the bus service not profitable, which will cause loss of the bus service.

This will make recruiting qualified people difficult because a large selling point is the low cost and convenience of transportation. It will also cause a very large strain and increase the death toll on our state highways.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 152 (Code 174)

I hope that DOE, in its decision to outsource the bus operations, takes steps to ensure that the transportation quality, safety record, and cost to employees stays the same. Should costs increase, it will mean that I and my fellow employees will be forced to drive to the site in personal vehicles. Road conditions are already such that many people are killed on this road every year. Bus services keeps the workforce safe by eliminating needs to drive. However, if the cost becomes greater, so will the increased traffic. Increased traffic will certainly mean more accidents and fatalities. DOE should take the interests of its workforce to heart and make every effort to ensure our safety.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 153 (Code 175)

Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham recently stated that "Ensuring the safety of our workers is paramount and I will not tolerate any action by any contractor that will undermine worker safety." NE-ID evidently doesn't feel that this paradigm applies to them. The proposal to privatize INEEL bus operations is completely opposed to concern for worker safety, since the resultant increase in rider prices will ensure that far fewer workers ride the buses. These workers will join the parade of cars on the highway each day and be exposed to grave hazards from drivers who demonstrate their lack of regard for others by speeding and unwise passing. It's already bad out there. It'll be a lot worse if the buses are privatized due to the larger number of cars on the road. Actually, this just looks like a clever scheme to eliminate the buses since it is highly doubtful that workers will support a higher-priced system in sufficient numbers for the contractor to turn a profit.

DOE can be justifiably proud of the safety record that the buses and their drivers have created over several decades. Don't throw that away. Practice VPP, don't just preach it. Don't privatize the buses.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 154 (Code 176)

Outsourcing the site bus service is a very dangerous idea. Saving money by doing something that will result in many more injured and killed employees and members of the public is wrong. If the bus service is privatized the contractor will expect to make a profit. This will result in higher fares and thus, less riders! This in turn will result in still higher fares and cancellation of routes. This problem will continue to spiral and will probably result in eventual elimination of the bus service because the contractor can't make a profit. The result will be a continually expanding number of employees driving out to the site on the ancient two lane road called Highway-20. The only way to avoid the ensuing carnage would be to build a four-lane center-divided highway out to the site, but that would cost more than retaining the current subsidized bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 155 (Code 177)

I am opposed to privatization of our bus service it is likely that the outstanding record of safe, convenient, and reliable bus transportation available to the employees of the INEEL may not be sustained if the transportation service is outsourced.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 156 (Code 179)

I understand that this proposal includes privatizing the bus service. This will lead to a significant increase in cost which will have severe consequences.

It will become significantly cheaper to drive rather than ride the bus. There are not sufficient parking facilities at the INL for this. In addition, the increased traffic on the highways will lead to more accidents and more likely more fatalities. This is an approximate 75 minute drive through the desert. Fatigue is a major problem with driving and more tired drivers will also lead to more fatalities. I have not driven since I would be driving on the left shoulder on my way home.

The other problem that many will face, including myself, is owning only one vehicle. I have five kids at home so my wife needs to have the car available. I most likely would have to quit my job and hope I can find a comparably paying job closer to home.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 166 (Code 189)

I am totally against privatization of any of the support groups currently at the INEEL. This is going to lead to lower paying, less secure jobs with lesser benefits for the employees! Please don't let this happen to the great work force we currently have at the INEEL.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 178 (Code 201)

I am writing with concern to the proposal of the bus operation outsourcing. First of all I believe that outsourcing to a lower cost operation ultimately will involve some safety compromise. If this action also leads to more people driving (even with car pooling) the traffic and danger on the highways to the site will be increased. It has been my observation over the last few years that many drivers to and from the site are out of state workers. They do not seem to realize and drive as though it is a "two lane" highway. You see many drivers exceeding the speed limit and pulling out to pass without apparent passing opportunity and visibility, i.e., obstruction from hills, etc. It appears like they do not realize that it is only a two lane road and expect that oncoming traffic can pull over off of the shoulder. I suspect if this proposal is completed there will be a directly associated increase in accidents and injuries on the highways. I would therefore recommend its reconsideration.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 188 (Code 213)

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN;

IN RESPONSE TO THE PROPOSED INEEL (RFP) I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON THE TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS PROPOSED. IF OUTSOURCING OF THE BUS SERVICE IS ESTABLISHED, MANY INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE FORCED TO COMMUTE BY PRIVATE VEHICLE, DUE TO THE FINANCIAL INCREASE. AS WE ALL KNOW, THE TWO LANE HIGHWAY LEADING TO THE SITE IS NOT THE SAFEST AS IT IS. WITH THE ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC THAT WILL BE GENERATED, THE SAFETY

CONCERNS WILL ESCALATE. THE BUS SERVICE NOW SERVES NEAR 400/450 PASSENGERS DAILY TO ANL-W ALONE, NOT TO INCLUDE OTHER AREAS OF THE SITE. THE ADDED INCREASE OF PRIVATE VEHICLES WOULD BE TREMENDOUS, CAUSING MUCH CONCERN TO THE SAFETY OF COMING AND RETURNING FROM THE WORK AREA. I WOULD ENCOURAGE THE BUS SERVICE TO CONTINUE OPERATION AS IS, UNTIL THESE SAFETY CONCERNS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED IN FULL

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 189 (Code 214)

I oppose privatization of the guards, cafeteria services and bus operations at the INEEL. Especially bus operations, with their great safety record and the invaluable service they provide to myself and INEEL employees.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 190 (Code 215)

I would not like to see the bus system go away as it currently is. The bus drivers we have had over the years have been very safe and have provided an excellent service. The current cost is something we can live with and should be provided for the employees here at the INEEL and ICP. I know this would be very devastating to many employees. Why do we consistently try to screw the employees over here at the site! I don't think privatization is going to do anything but drive the cost up and cause many to car pool instead of taking a bus service causing the road to be even more unsafe and aren't we trying to promote safety here!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 194 (Code 236)

I am concerned with the proposed privatization of the bus system.

If the bus prices go up much more, we will see a dramatic increase in traffic on the roads from Idaho Falls and Pocatello to the INL. There will be an increase in the number of accidents on the highways and in the communities as hundreds of people try to get to work at the same time.

We will have to build new parking lots to handle all of the cars and pickups that drive out every day. They won't be able to park off the pavement as that is a fire hazard.

Is anything being done to offset the increased costs? Is there going to be any subsidizing to help offset the price of the tickets?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 196 (Code 246)

Dear Sirs, I have 2 comments. Since the inception of VPP here at the INL, we have had "safety" pressed in our daily lives. We have ate, drank, and slept safely from this issue. Then came ISMS, this program gives us many tools to help us avoid unsafe conditions. In your RFP you discuss the "privatization" of the INL busses. This mode of transportation has given all of us the added safety of travel to and from the INL. Many of us work long, or shift work. After these days supporting our DOE customer, we then crawl on a bus and go safely home. If you send our "safe" bus service out for bid to become privatized we will lose this safe means for travel to work. I don't think that the Idaho State Police, State of Idaho Transportation Dept, and the Emergency Services around the INL are ready for another 4000 vehicles on the highway home. I think that the busses are

a necessary tool for the "safe" operation of the INL.

Second: We work 50 miles from the nearest McDonalds. The cafe's provide us the next best thing to home cooking. We do not have the opportunity to run down the street and pick up something hot to eat, like the folks in town. Please don't make this decision to remove or change our food resource system. Thanks for your time.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 197 (Code 250)

The privatization of the bus service would have disastrous effects on the people of INEEL and their families. This service has been a help to all who have worked on the desert for many years. The people suggesting this avenue have to know that lives will be lost on these dangerous roads if this comes to fruition. The bus service is subsidized because the company knows (knew) that to get the employees here safely will save money in the long run. I thought safety was a major concern at this installation. Those who can no longer afford the fares will have to drive. Even one person injured as a result of this privatization and their pain is on your shoulders.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 198 (Code 274)

My question/comment is about the outsourcing/privitization of the INEEL bus service that is mentioned in the RFP press release. I have worked at the INEEL for 15 years and choose to ride the bus to and from work every day for a number of reasons. (1) Cost - the existing cost (in spite of the recent increase) of a bus pass is still cheaper than driving each day, (2) Safety - the main reason I choose to ride the bus is because it is still the safest way to travel to and from the site. The 2 main roads from Idaho Falls and Blackfoot are only two lanes and have proven to be very dangerous with many fatal accidents over the years. A good bus service not only places fewer vehicles on these roads, it also places professional drivers at the wheel that "drive the speed limit". I hate to drive these roads between 0600 - 0700 and 1730 - 1830 as the majority of the personal vehicles drive 15 - 20 MPH over the speed limit and do not seem to slow down even when weather conditions warrant it. Due to the present working hours at the site (very early mornings and long days) I am very tired and do not want to be driving a vehicle when I am not alert, especially during the winter months when it is dark both in the morning and in the evening, (3) Reliability - I don't have to worry about being stranded on the road in the middle of the desert when I choose to ride the bus. If one of the buses break down, it's only a matter of minutes until a back-up bus arrives to transfer the passengers and take them safely to their destination (4) Parking - There is limited parking spaces at the facility where I work for personal vehicles. During special events when bus services are not available, i.e. family day, people are parking in the weeds creating a fire hazard.

If the bus service is to be outsourced (subcontracted) will DOE continue to subsidize the operation to keep this a safe, reliable, and especially cost effective service? If not, the bus service costs will surely increase to the point that it will force even it's loyalist passengers to start driving. If this happens, the number of vehicles on these roads will increase significantly causing the accident and death toll of not only site workers but other drivers traveling to and from work, school, vacation, etc. to also increase. Having to drive will also cause stress levels to skyrocket for those who are forced to drive in these conditions, especially during inclement weather. This stress will surely impact employee performance at work, also causing the job related accident rate to increase. Parking will become an issue and larger lots will need to be built to keep the cars out of the weeds, as we don't need any more wild fires. I am one of many who are right on the edge, balancing the safety and convenience of the bus service against the cost of the same. Any additional cost increases would force me into a car pool adding to the traffic problem. For the safety of all, please do not place the INEEL workers in a position that will put us all at risk. Lives are at stake here! VPP, STAR, ISMS, WASP and all of the other safety programs we have instituted over the years has sent a clear message that DOE cares about the safety of it's employees and those working for the various contractors and subcontractors. Otherwise, you are simply sending the message to all that a price can be put on safety and even a human life.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 201 (Code 277)

I understand the RFP includes a provision to privatize the INEEL bus operations. My opinion is that this should not be done. Privatizing the operations will result in increased traffic on the roads to the site with an increase in accidents. It will also reduce reliability of transportation. Also, there will be a decrease in efficiency. All these things will bring a net increase in transportation and operation costs. I encourage the DOE to continue INEEL bus operations as they are now.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 16g

Question No. 205 (Code 281)

I am taking the time, such as one does when its time to vote, as this is a very important opportunity to be able to voice my concerns regarding privatization of the Bus Fleet. Please do not continue to consider to out source this service. I have worked at the site, now working on my 15th year, and I as a taxpayer have been amazed at the waste of tax payer dollars due to what can only be lumped under the wording, "bad choices made".

Cut back on the spending. Whats so hard about that? Not everyone needs a new computer, ergonomic chairs, flat screened monitors, vehicles that aren't properly used as the company intended.

Check on your process you have in place. Millions and millions of dollars are wasted due to projects changing their paths. Look at your warehouses and see how many items are excessed yearly...that were never used.

I could go on an on, but, its all common knowledge.

The one thing that I can praise is that Safety is a very important issue at the company. Now, I question that, due to the thought process to privatize the safest source you have in place in getting your employees back and forth to work. Eliminating what you are aware of, 50 Safe years of fantastic service, you will be letting us know, that truly you don't care, safety isn't that important and concrete the feeling thats in place, which is, people-your employees who have made you successful by meeting your milestones so that you may obtain gains as well as praises aren't important.

Please consider that privatizing this service, may not be a wise decision.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 16g

Question No. 206 (Code 282)

I am taking the time, such as one does when its time to vote, as this is a very important opportunity to be able to voice my concerns regarding privatization of the Bus Fleet. Please do not continue to consider to out source this service. I have worked at the site, now working on my 15th year, and I as a taxpayer have been amazed at the waste of tax payer dollars due to what can only be lumped under the wording, "bad choices made".

Cut back on the spending. Whats so hard about that? Not everyone needs a new computer, ergonomic chairs, flat screened monitors, vehicles that aren't properly used as the company intended.

Check on your process you have in place. Millions and millions of dollars are wasted due to projects changing their paths. Look at your warehouses and see how many items are excessed yearly...that were never used.

I could go on an on, but, its all common knowledge.

The one thing that I can praise is that Safety is a very important issue at the company. Now, I question that, due to the thought process to privatize the safest source you have in place in getting your employees back and forth to work. Eliminating what you are aware of, 50 Safe years of fantastic service, you will be letting us know, that truly you don't care, safety isn't that important and concrete the feeling thats in place, which is, people-your employees who have made you successful by meeting your milestones so that you may obtain gains as well as praises aren't important.

Please consider that privatizing this service, may not be a wise decision.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 207 (Code 283)

I am a maintainance pipe fitter at INTEC. I feel that D.O.E.'s decision to privatize the bus and transportation system at the site is a bad one. There are many reasons and the main one is safety. It's bad enough that D.O.E. did not require BNFL to sign on to the bus system and has now made the roads going to the site more dangerous.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 208 (Code 284)

This letter is in response to the intent to privatize the transportation system that is currently available to employees who work at the INEEL site. As a recent graduate from college, I was more than excited when I was offered a position at the INEEL just over 3 months ago. I recently started work there (only 3 weeks ago) and am finding that the atmosphere and work that I do there is more than I was hoping for. I am able to advance in my field of expertise while learning from tremendous individuals. Of the many comments that I hear, one of the major fears that I have is not only the deaths that are sure to be incorporated with the increase of traffic, but also the desire for an early retirement from many of the individuals who have put in many years at the INEEL; many of whom I could learn a tremendous amount of knowledge from based on their experience. I fully understand that there will be busses offered to the employees, but both feel and have heard that there will be such an increase in the costs of transportation, that many of the employees who currently do ride the bus to work will choose alternative routes (of which I have described as early retirement). I do feel that as a part of my continued success and extreme satisfaction at work at the INEEL, the bus system plays a role greater than most feel it plays. I am sure this will be evident upon researching the effects that privatizing the transportation system will have; not only on the employees at the INEEL, but also the surrounding communities, as they will not benefit as some may think they will. I urge you to take into consideration the many potential problems that will arise if the transportation system is privatized. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 209 (Code 285)

I am concerned about the bus service being outsourced. With the safety record buses have now why would your want to have a bus service with less credentials. I feel that this would be jeopardizing the lives of many employees, since many more would drive out rather than pay a hefty fee to ride out. What happened to star status VPP & ISMS?

Response:

Section B, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 210 (Code 286)

Privatizing the buses is a really bad idea. The cost to ride a bus will be so high that everyone will choose to car pool. Highways 20 and 26 cannot handle the additional traffic. With the increased traffic there will be more accidents. How can DOE preach VPP and ISMS and knowingly put their employees and private citizens who travel those highways in this much danger? Construction workers get paid a per diem to drive to the site. Are you going to pay the rest of the site workers a per diem to drive to the site? That would be the only fair thing since town workers will not have to pay additional money for transportation. Putting that many more vehicles on these highways will increase the amount of pollution and cause damage to the environment. With this many more cars driving to the site you will have to increase parking facilities at the site.

Response:

Section I, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 216 (Code 292)

I don't want the bus services to be outsourced because that will drive up the cost to get to and from work. I commute 90 minutes one way and it would make it so I would have to move closer to the INEEL.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 217 (Code 293)

I have utilized the bus service to the INL site for more than 24 years. I have enjoyed a very safe and reliable system. It has also been very affordable. I am concerned that a significant increase in bus fares to the rider will result in use of the busses to be less economical than driving a personal vehicle. Any increase in vehicle traffic on the 2 lane highways leading to the INL site will result in an increase in accidents and delays in getting to work on time. This is especially true during the winter months when the roads are covered with ice and snow.

Also, the parking lot at the Naval Reactor Facility where I work is barely large enough to handle the amount of personal vehicles that park there now.

In conclusion, I would ask that, above all, you consider the safety of site employees before you make changes to the current bus service to the INL site.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 222 (Code 298)

I am concerned that the privatization of the bus service to the INEEL is the first step toward the elimination of that service. I agree with many of the already submitted comments about safety, reliability, and increased costs. The DOE should also factor into their decision that some employees will consider other employment if no bus service to the site is available. This service makes a 12 hour shift easier to accomplish. Thanks so much.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 223 (Code 299)

The proposal to privatize bus service to the INEEL will only serve as a detriment to all. The problems include but are not limited to:

1. Increased transportation cost to employees. A private service provider will need to increase ticket prices to make a profit.
2. Most employees will then elect to drive personal vehicles resulting in reduced employee job performance due to fatigue.
2. The absolute MINIMUM daily commute for site workers (ANL-W) is 70 miles. A good sitewide average would be closer to 100 miles. Multiply this by all the increased private vehicles on the road and the result is an absurd waste of national fuel resources compared to the current bus system.

3. The highway in its current state can barely support existing traffic. A massive increase in daily traffic would result in more injuries and deaths from accidents.
4. Accelerated wear on the roadway itself due to increased traffic necessitating constant repairs or upgrades.

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 224 (Code 300)

Part of this RFP is to privatize the bus service. I know this is a great expense to subsidize in order to prevent needless deaths of site workers on the poor 2-lane highways (but then again, site workers are a dime a dozen; or so we are told). Why is it that the site workers are always taking the hit when it comes to cutting costs? I have seen the price of 1-way bus rides go from 25 cents to the current \$1.30. The site workers donate 2 hours per day to get to work. If the bus service is privatized we may be paying \$7.00 or more per day. This will force most people to drive because the buses will become cost prohibitive. This will in turn invariably cause more accidents and deaths on highways 20 and 33 which are only 2-lane (one each direction). Site workers consist of the backbone of INEL are a proud lot, why not start treating them like a national resource rather than a liability?

One year Management is trying to figure out why it is difficult to get people to work out at the site and trying to come up with ways to entice people out there. The next year they are cutting more benefits and basically undoing everything they did on a positive note. When will management get smart and quit the flip flopping?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 225 (Code 301)

The INEEL Bus system is undoubtedly the most successful "safety" program in the history of the site. Outsourcing this system to private industry would be a disaster (No business could charge enough for tickets to make money and maintain any kind of decent system.) The system should stay as it is with the government subsidy. Many top people will look for work elsewhere if buses are no longer available because US 20 is just too dangerous to drive and it would become far more dangerous to drive with no bus system at all. Please reconsider! Thanks for your time.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 226 (Code 302)

There is currently no language in either RFP regarding existing technical programs such as the INEEL Welding Program or the R-Stamp Program. It makes no sense to terminate these programs, particularly the welding program. Far greater expense will ultimately result if each contractor has to develop their own program. If the welding program is not specifically authorized by DOE (as with the existing DOE order) then contractors will not be able to use the single common program and still be in code compliance. Furthermore, the incumbent contractor will have an unfair advantage since they are aware of the program and the inherent cost savings. The INEEL Welding Program has been the best model within the DOE complex for a consolidated and shared welding program for almost 20 years. Future missions for the INEEL will depend on cost effective operation and a consolidated program is the best way to achieve cost savings in the welding arena.

Response:

Comment noted. The INL Contractor will decide how to accomplish the Statement of Work.

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 228 (Code 303)

Privatization of Bus Services

I object to your proposal to privatize bus ops at the Site. Site workers fear the cost to ride the bus will increase

to the point where workers will elect to drive their private vehicles--this will make travel to the Site much, much, more unsafe. Privatizing bus services will also cause an exodus of professional workers from the Site and East Idaho because by privatizing bus ops you'll make working at the Site even less attractive. Please do not privatize bus services to the Site.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 229 (Code 304)

My comments relate to DOE's decision to "launch Privatization" of bus operations. Outsourcing will result in increased cost to the users which will cause many employees to either drive or transfer to jobs in town (either way "we" loose). The increased traffic will mean more accidents and more deaths. I don't believe that privatization will be "profitable" in the end when one considers the value of life. In addition to loss of life, the Site would, most likely, loose some of its most valuable and hardworking employees as more and more personnel transfer to town positions or other jobs.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 2.3

Question No. 246 (Code 323)

I am concerned about the INEEL's intention to privatize the bus services to the site. Of particular concern to me is that no assessment has been made of the increased risk to the site workers that such a move would entail.

It should be obvious that any private company that runs a bus service to the INEEL facilities cannot do so profitably without either a) raising bus fares dramatically from current levels, or b) obtaining subsidies from the government to offset the losses incurred by continuing to charge the same low fares. If bus fares increase, even by a small amount, a certain number of employees will stop using the buses and start driving private vehicles to work. The higher the price increase, the greater the number of employees that will choose to drive.

The increased highway travel will result in an increased number of accidents and an increased number of deaths. This is a statistical certainty. The question that the INEEL administration must ask itself before making a decision to privatize the buses is, "How many employees are we willing to kill in order to save a few bucks?"

Has a risk assessment ever been performed on the hazards of increased traffic to the site? Such an assessment is a NEPA requirement for any proposed construction or modification at the site, yet I fear that it may not be required for bus service modifications. It should be required, and if not required, it should be demanded by anyone who cares about employee and public safety. The adverse impacts of bus privatization are measurable and need to be considered before changes are made.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 250 (Code 327)

As a dedicated and loyal cold war worker why is it costing me more at every turn to be part of the solution to clean up the lab? The initial suggestions for change involve more cost to me personally. Will there be a point beyond which it will be counter productive for me to continue to be part of the solution? Already there are those who find it more to thier liking to drive. With this captive group how can you hope to compete equally with locations in town? A 5-10 or 15 minute drive to work needs no support. An hour each way changes the whole picture. We have already lost members of our community to increased traffic. Where is the saturation point? The bus provides some relief. To increase the cost will place it out of the realm of reason for many.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 252 (Code 329)

privatizing the bus service would only make the cost go up and many would drive who have not been driving. The increased traffic I believe would be a less safe way and less efficient way to get to work. I think the bus service is best the way it is at present.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 253 (Code 330)

This comment is in reference to the clause in the proposed RFP to privatize the bus service. I think we have one of the best, most cost effective, and safe bus transportation systems available at the INEEL. I have personally experienced privatization in the past and cannot emphasize enough the negative impact something of this nature will have. Even though it looks attractive to DOE ID to put these costs onto someone else, everyone involved will loose, higher costs to riders, reduction in wages and benefits to drivers, quality and maintenance of equipment, and the INEEL becomes a less attractive place to work. All in the name of cutting costs. Don't do it. Why fix something that isn't broken?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 254 (Code 331)

Regarding the cost of Bus service and its outstanding safety record,nobody can do it better! Do not fix what isn't broke.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 258 (Code 337)

I think changing the bus service to a private contractor will increase the price which will cause people to drive to work making the highway very unsafe.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 259 (Code 338)

DOE's decision to privatize the INEEL bus service is a cause for great concern. I can't help but see it as evidence of a complete lack of concern for employee and public safety. The roads are already hazardous for private travel, especially in winter months, and privatization of the bus service is likely to push costs of bus travel high enough that most employees will be forced to use their own vehicles for the commute. The additional traffic on already busy highways has got to result in greatly increased numbers of accidents as people try to get back and forth to work.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 263 (Code 423)

My question is this: Has DOE thought through what would happen to the safety of the workers of the various facilities at the INEEL if the bus service is put up for privatization? Currently, there are only 2-lane highways that are over used by the people that don't want to ride the buses because they don't want to leave for work at 5:30 a.m. and get home at 7 to 7:30 p.m. I know the INEEL is base on a work schedule of Monday through Thursday 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., but has any consideration been given to the shif worker? I work shift work so my day either starts at 5:10 a.m. when I catch the bus in Pocatello and continues until 8:30 p.m. when I get off the bus back in Pocatello, or it runs from 5:20 p.m. until 8:30 a.m. depending upon the shift I'm on. This is on average of 15 hours per day when the weather is good and the roads are clear, this time does increase when

the roads and the weather is questionable. The few times that I have driven to the INEEL the time saved is only about 20 min. to 30 min. in the morning and the same in the evening, but the added stress and fatigue that was encountered does not make the time saved worth the added risk to my safety. Will the DOE or the private company be responsible for the lives of the people that are put at risk if the cost of the bus service is too great for the workforce. I would appreciate a response to these questions.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 264 (Code 424)

Funding for the bus service needs to be added back into the RFP, otherwise there will be no bus service. If BBWI was accurate in their information on costs (\$40.00/week/person) when they justified the increase in fares and that's what would be charged employees to ride, then no one will ride. The current price is just barely less than it would be to drive out in a car. Bottom line is that safety and the environment are important only if the employees bare the cost of this service, not DOE or the contractor.

DOE and the contractor preach the importance of safety and environment, but refuse to fund programs that make a difference and are not part of the "work day." Or to be more blunt, they are willing to compromise the safety of their workers and anyone else traveling the highways to and from the site for a few dollars.

Response:

Section H, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 265 (Code 425)

I started working at the INEL at TRA (Test Reactor Area) in 1976 as a Pipefitter. I have given the best working years of my life to working at the "site." I have taken thousands of hours of training and attained a high level of expertise in my field. Like many workers on any industrial site, my health has suffered from exposure to chemicals and radiation. I am a confirmed Asbestosis sufferer as a result of working in close proximity to this dangerous substance without benefit of a respirator – unfortunately, there is no longer any reimbursement for this exposure. I have had multiple thyroid problems – including tumors - likely as a result of exposure to radiation at the INEL, and this will certainly shorten my life. Prior to 1985 airborne cesium was not seen as a health risk.

<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

During this time, I have seen the companies that have contracted with the government for management at the INEL erode our health and retirement benefits. DOE has backed away from the commitment to the employee and the community to provide oversight over the contractors, to the point that workers are now pretty much at the mercy of companies who consider us disposable. Now, with the current approach to contracting and to "privatizing" so many functions at the INEL, I am looking at the DOE and the companies vying for this lucrative contract conspiring to "screw me out of" my benefits just as I near retirement.

At one time we could count on DOE to provide real oversight to make sure that the workers at Nuclear facilities were treated fairly and justly. Now, the "hands-off" approach means that the skilled, trained, proven workforce that has developed around the INEL – the skilled "memory" of the INEL – is dispensable. If it were possible, I am sure that the INEL contractors would cheerfully export our functions to nameless third-world cheap labor – even if it resulted in more accidents and deaths, the company would probably still be profitable.

No longer is there a concern that the Nuclear testing facilities hire and retain the very best, most highly skilled, and experienced workers. Now it is a matter of "Wal-Mart-izing" the delivery of services at the nation's engineering laboratories. Does the DOE really want this nation's Atomic Energy establishment in the hands of laborers from the lowest bidder? And the most ruthless? It is as simple a question as this: Does DOE stand for integrity?

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 274 (Code 435)

Privatization of Bus Service -

Bus service to the facilities on the desert must be maintained at their current levels. The current highways to the site, as well as the parking facilities on the site, are often loaded to capacity with the bus service currently provided. If bus service is privatized, the costs to the riders would likely rise. This would force more people to drive their personal vehicles, causing even more over-crowding on the highways and the parking lots.

If you intend to "retain highly-skilled, experienced, world-class talent to perform the work" at the INL, there had better be a "safe, efficient" means of mass-transportation to and from the facilities on the desert.

You would think that DOE would want to remain on the cutting edge of solving the transportation problems facing the United States by pursuing viable means of mass transportation as a demonstration project on the INL.

Response:

Section C, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 2.4

Question No. 281 (Code 442)

2.4.B.1 (page C-11) With this established goal and the previous requirement of "Reduce or eliminate non-core services and functions through innovative business arrangements," this statement could be in conflict with safety goals. A specific example is the INEEL bus service. The remote site of the INL was chosen by the AEC Reactor Safeguards committee in 1947. This requirement is still desirable for remote, pre-eminent nuclear laboratory exploring first-of-kind reactors and reactor system. To have synergy with these two requirements the bus system was implemented. Provide provisions for "subsidy for safety" to supply economic incentives for employees to ride the bus. This is the cost of doing business in a safe, remote environment. This is, and will be the strength of the INL -- the largest and most remote national laboratory in the nation. Subcontracting the bus service to the Fort Hall reservation is innovative but please provide the subsidy to keep ridership and the roads safe for all.

Response:

Section I, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. 22

Question No. 295 (Code 457)

I.22.4 (page I-33) We fully support DOE intent to protect employees and the public. One of the most common and greatest risks is the commute to our remote INL, which is also this laboratory's greatest strength. The contractor should be encouraged to increase bus usage, which is more environmentally friendly (less fuel, less CO2), and safer for employees (fewer personal automobile accidents). DOE needs to make provisos/statements in this contract such as "Subsidized employee transportation for safety is encouraged."

Response:

Section A, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 301 (Code 465)

I would like to see the bus service continue as it is now even if it means we have to pay more money. The park and ride idea was a failure at Hanford. I don't think it would work here and would put more cars on the road. We know and trust our bus drivers now and I worry about what will happen if the service is out sourced. I know that the majority of the site is in a down size mode but to try to hire people to work at the site is hard enough now with out telling people they have to drive to work bumper to bumper on a two lane road for 50 miles. It is always intresting to me that people who work in town are the people making the call for those of us who ride the bus.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 332 (Code 499)

The bus system must remain an integral part of the INEEL contract. The INEEL is a remote site. Basic necessities are not available near the site for workers. No public water systems, sewer systems, schools, hospitals, and housing are available within 25 miles of the Site. A forty-mile radius must be included to encompass such facilities adequate for site workers and their immediate families. The average 40-mile commute is not optional for site workers. Site workers have no alternatives to 40-mile commutes.

The bus system must not be privatized but must remain an integral part of the system. The cost to employees should reflect, not the cost of providing the service, charges should be leveled simply to encourage efficient use of the system.

In addition to the length of the commute is the hazard of the commute. The main site access is a two-lane highway which is not designed to accommodate the traffic resulting from privatizing the bus service. The remoteness of the Site combined with the flat terrain make it extremely hazardous in winter and windy driving conditions. There is nothing to shelter the road from the weather. Any compromise in the bus transportation system will result in loss of human lives.

Any attempt to reduce the level of bus service sends the message that the site is to be abandoned. The advantages of the integrated bus service are obvious: the unparalleled safety record, the reduced costs for parking lots at the Site, reduced cost to the State of Idaho for highway maintenance, reduced costs for state police response to accidents.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 340 (Code 562)

4. The Draft RFPs assume that the cafeteria work will be privatized and thus the current cafeteria workers will be laid off. PACE asks that this decision be reviewed and overturned. In order to attract a quality workers, maintain efficiencies and provide quality service for a round the clock workforce the cafeteria should remain operational as it currently exists. This change could result in significant cost increases for meals to employees that have no other alternative source of food given the location of the site. PACE requests that the Department of Energy review this privatization decision for one year to determine if cost saving can be attained under the current process. The Department should require use of the cost/benefit analysis model agreed upon in Attachment A of the current collective bargaining agreement and the agreement between OCAW and DOE dated December 14, 1995 under the Consent Decree in OCAW v. O'Leary, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civ. Action No. 95-0981-WBB. This modification should also be applied to the Fleet Management, including operation of a bus service.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No. N/

Question No. 344 (Code 305)

I have a comment about the bus system. The site bus system is an example of a transportation system that I believe is very beneficial to the communities served. And for that reason it really ought to be left in place and maintained. (Perhaps this has been studied, I have not read one.) True, there are big expenses to operate it. But the benefits such as safety and the reduced number of vehicles on roads and highways have got to far out weigh the operating expenses. If necessary, look at cutting taxpayer costs, but please leave the bus system in place.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 345 (Code 568)

I would like to voice my concerns with the privatization of the bus service.

I am deeply concerned with the amount of traffic that will be on our present road system from Sage Junction to

the site. The present two-lane system simply will not handle the additional 200+ cars that will be traveling this route. My deepest concern is the rural life along this road. We will be passing through school and church zones with many businesses and residents along the way. This would be a year round concern seeing the amount of school busses, truck and trailers and livestock that use this roadway. It is well documented that livestock have been killed as well as wildlife. The open range portion has also seen road kills. The rodeo grounds are used often and has documented a small child being killed there crossing the road to the neighborhood market. There is also the heavy use of RVs throughout the year. How tragic that someone is willing to sacrifice the innocent people for the sake of the might dollar.

In addition, the safety record of our drivers is unbeatable. They care about their responsibilities because they live here, too, and this is their livelihood. I trust my driver in all weather conditions and in their ability to deliver me in a safe and timely manner to my work place.

I am also voicing my concern to the Jefferson County sheriff department and the Idaho State police, as well as my congressmen. I am sure they can provide additional input that will show that these concerns are real.

We have been safety oriented to the point of Star status. We trust ourselves to continue this process, but what about the guy who hasn't been taught or worse yet, doesn't care.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 346 (Code 592)

keep the bus service. You cannot beat their safety record. We are committed to safety. We need to keep the current cafeteria contract also.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 384 (Code 667)

Dear Sirs:

I have been a INEEL employee for nearly 28 years and enjoy the safety, comfort, and reliability of the INEEL bus system. I am currently a Industrial Safety Engineer. My question is this, in your new RFP, why are you looking at subcontracting the bus service. Have you ever driven out to the site at the normal starting or quitting times especially highway 20 which runs from the site to Idaho Falls. The traffic is awful and you are taking your life in your own hands (especially those traveling in the opposite direction.) You rarely see the Idaho State Police patrolling this highway (probably because they value their lives also). Putting more cars on the road will not help with highway safety. You have been very adamant about the contractor being part of the Voluntary Protection Plan, but you don't seem to be concerned with the INEEL employees safety to and from work. It is a proven fact, that more traffic on highways means more accidents and more fatalities. If you are really interested in our safety, you should reconsider subcontracting this out to another group who will probably not be able to provide the service we are getting now for a competitive price, thus more workers will drive their own cars to work (most using means of car pooling with other workers). This will only put more traffic on a already taxed two-lane road. I would ask you to reconsider your plan and let safety be incorporated into your decision which will have a major impact on thousands of families in Eastern Idaho. Please don't make the Idaho State Police have to make regular visits to INEEL employees families to tell them that their father or mother will not be coming home ever again!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 386 (Code 669)

I have worked out at the Ineel for over 25years if you include working at NRF for a contractor. During this time I have used the present bus service. I have had safe rides from home to work and back. I remember many winters looking out as we were driving along in weather I could never imagine even going to or from work in. We always got out to work and back safely. Pleas do not privatize the Bus service. If the price to ride goes up

from its present cost. I like others if not everyone will drive. I can only imagine cars bumper to bumper all the way out to work on US 20. It is crazy enough. Right now we have a safe reliable service. Bus drivers have homes and lives you could be destroying. Anyone who chooses to drive you will be the ones with it on your heads if anyone gets killed driving out to work because you changed the bus service!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 387 (Code 670)

BUS OPERATIONS - Comment

As a passenger, I do not wish bus operations to be "outsourced". Current operations provide benefits/service that I believe could not be duplicated by an outsourced provider as follows:

Current operations provide:

Competent, experienced, respectful, capable, safe drivers.

A reliable schedule for pickup of passengers at designated stops

A comfortable, stress-free transportation system for transporting me to my job under adverse weather conditions of all types

Economical means of getting to work and back home.

The current system of bus transportation provides safe and economical transportation for employees at a "remote site" such as the INEEL. The safety record of the current system is exemplary. To outsource this service is to reduce its efficiency. Probable increases in ticket costs would increase the number of private vehicles transporting employees to and from the site. An increase in traffic increases the probability of traffic accidents and lost-time employee injuries. Increased vehicle numbers pressure Security to increase inspections. Private vehicle travel, influenced by weather, will result in lost productivity due to employee absences. Parking areas for increased private vehicle numbers are not available and would have to be established. Maintenance of those areas would be required.

The INEEL is a DOE remote site. Services; e.g., bus transportation, are needed to attract/employ quality personnel at the site.

Don't outsource transportation services!!

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 414 (Code 697)

This is in reference to the sub-contracting of the bus service to the INL. The bus service provides a safe ride and greatly reduces the amount of cars on the highway. A sub-contractor would need to increase the cost per ride and this would increase the number of people driving thier own cars or car pooling. The highway between Idaho Falls and the Site will not handle the new amount of traffic wittout an increase in danger to the workers and vendors of the site,not to mention the drivers just passing through the area. Keep the buses operating from the site with the main contractor it has worked for years, and could work for many more.

Response:

Section E, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 415 (Code 698)

Disagree with privatizing the bus service. Should we entrust this type of safety to the lowest bidder?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 437 (Code 720)

As a wife of one of your employees, I would like to speak against outsourcing INEEL bus service. My husband leaves at 5 a.m. in the morning. He rarely gets more than 6 hours sleep at night during the work week.

I would be so concerned about him driving to work every day. Right now we know that there are trustworthy drivers and the price is reasonable. To outsource the bus service would create a lot of competition for riders, which would make an added burden for people to find a ride. Many will end up driving themselves which would cause a lot traffic on the highway, more accidents, breakdowns, and danger. Winter is not the only time of concern. In the summer there are more vacationers on the road with trailers and boats, etc. I hope that you will reconsider this matter.

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 438 (Code 721)

Privatizing the bus system at the INEEL would create very unsafe conditions for all who use the highways to and from the INEEL.

If riding the buses is not affordable, too many cars will be on already heavily traveled roadways.

Thank you

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 461 (Code 744)

Privatization of the Bus Fleet.

Where are the questions concerning the privatization of the bus fleet that have been submitted?

Response:

Section Z-General, Attachment or Provision/Clause No.

Question No. 520 (Code 803)

I have a comment regarding the buses at the INEEL site. I work at ANL-W and am worried that if the bus contract is given to an outside contractor that not only will the bus service be changed drastically, it will also be more expensive. When the prices were raised to \$50.00 per book of tickets, I really had a difficult time being able to purchase bus tickets, but decided that it was still a better deal than driving my own vehicle to work. I am a secretary, and I don't make the kind wages that can handle higher bus costs. I also worry that I will no longer be able to walk to my bus stop because of changes in routes. I've also been told that we might be reduced to park and ride bus lots, which sounds like a traffic nightmare. If this change happens there will be a lot more traffic on Highway 20, and more accidents. Bigger parking lots will have to be built. Who will pay for those? Travel in winter will not only be dangerous, some people will opt not to come to work, so productivity will decrease on days when there is blowing and drifting snow on the highway. I realized that the bus system has been subsidized and is considered a benefit to those who work at the site, but to make it less accessible, more expensive and less desirable to use, just makes not sense to me. Also, what will happen to those loyal drivers that we have known for several years? When I started working at NRF in 1988 I was told that the bus services was a benefit for site workers because the government realizes that working so far out of town would be difficult. The bus service has come a long way and a lot of us ride it every day. Please don't take that away from us.

Response: